

ORHAN PAMUK'S NOVELS AND THEIR "AFTERLIFE" IN ENGLISH AND GERMAN TRANSLATIONS

BY

SEVINC TURKKAN

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Comparative Literature
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2012

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Wail S. Hassan, Chair
Professor Marilyn Booth, University of Edinburgh
Professor Mahir Saul
Assistant Professor Yasemin Yildiz

Abstract

In this dissertation, I focus on the Turkish Nobel Prize laureate Orhan Pamuk's novels and on their English and German translations by Güneli Gün, Maureen Freely, and Ingrid Iren. I argue that literary translation is a creative act, the study and critique of which needs to be anchored within a specific historical, geographical, and temporal horizon.

I studied the reception of Pamuk's novels in translation and discovered that book reviewers write about translations as if they were transparent copies of the original works. Literary translation in a largely monolingual public sphere is thus overlooked. I provide a theoretical model for the study and critique of translations as autonomous texts beyond the evaluative notion of "fidelity" to originals. I devise a theoretical framework based on my close textual analyses of the translations. I situate translations within their respective context, read them in relation to particular historical circumstances that gave rise to them, and in relation to secondary material written by translators, ranging from creative writing, other translations, prefaces, introductions, afterwords, glossaries, and interviews. This approach elucidates each translator's project, position, and intention.

The introduction provides literature review and lays out the theoretical framework. Chapter 1 consists of two parts. In part 1, I examine the reception of Orhan Pamuk in Turkey and abroad as revealed in reviews, articles, interviews, and book length manuscripts. In part 2, I read Pamuk's *Kara Kitap* (*The Black Book*), paying close attention to particular images, intertextual and metatextual aspects, and shifts in narrative voice. I choose elements of the novel that are self-referential and language-, context-, and culture-specific. Translation of these elements reveals the translators' literary and stylistic idiosyncrasies and how each translator recontextualized the text in unique ways. In chapter 2, I focus on the translator Güneli Gün and

identify her unique style as a writer. I argue that Gün's primary purpose as a translator was to bridge Turkish and American literatures and cultures and to introduce Pamuk to the Anglo-American readership in the era before he reached international fame. In chapter 3, I focus on Maureen Freely, who is widely known as Pamuk's definitive English translator since the Nobel Prize. I analyze her translations, novels, and journalistic writings in order to determine her idiosyncratic style and position as the author of the new translation. I argue that Freely translated the novel in ways that bolster Pamuk's later image as "the writer of the city of Istanbul." In chapter 4, I focus on Ingrid Iren, Pamuk's German translator and read her translation, *Das schwarze Buch*, in relation to the long history and legacy of translation into German, a context completely different from the previous ones. I argue that Iren performed a significant bridging role between the two languages and cultures through her active recreation of the Turkish narrative into German. The German text is heavily shaped by the translator. In the conclusion, I point to possible avenues for further research.

This study fills in an important gap in the scholarship on Orhan Pamuk by illuminating the role of his translators in the formation of his image as a world author.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Orhan Pamuk's <i>Kara Kitap</i> (1990).....	33
Chapter 2: Güneli Gün's <i>The Black Book</i> (1994).....	82
Chapter 3: Maureen Freely's <i>The Black Book</i> (2006).....	148
Chapter 4: Ingrid Iren's <i>Das schwarze Buch</i> (1995).....	230
Conclusion.....	296
Works Cited.....	299

Introduction

[A] translation comes later than the original, and since the important works of world literature never find their chosen translator at the time of their origin, their translation marks their stage of continued life.¹

—Benjamin, “The Task of the Translator”

In “The Task of the Translator,” Walter Benjamin’s introduction to his German translation of Charles Baudelaire’s *Tableaux Parisiens* (1923), translation stands as a metaphor for the afterlife of works of world literature. By its nature, a translation is a belated work. It comes after the original. It is impossible to give a simultaneous birth to an original and its translation. The secondary nature of the translated text has marked our understanding of translation negatively and has been the central problem of translation theory since its inception. Philosophers such as Walter Benjamin, Jacques Derrida, and Paul de Man initiated a radical rethinking of binaries such as “original” and “translation” by questioning the concepts of originality and authorship. In their writings, translation is an “afterlife” (*Überleben*), it is the “growth of the original,”² and it is what canonizes³ a work of literature. That is, translation is not an option; it is necessary for the original. The original calls for and desires its translation. In turn, translation revitalizes canons of world literature.

The quote from Benjamin above makes us rethink the status of the translated text in relation to the original as well as the status of the translator in relation to the author and canons

¹ “Ist doch die Übersetzung später als das Original, und bezeichnet sie doch bei den bedeutenden Werken, die da ihre erwählten Übersetzer niemals im Zeitalter ihrer Entstehung finden, das Stadium ihres Fortlebens” (*Illuminationen: Ausgewählte Schriften* 1961: 58). The quotation is from Harry Zohn’s translation of Benjamin’s essay in Venuti 2004, 76. Zohn’s translation is not without problems. He published the first English translation of Benjamin’s essay “Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers” in 1968. Because of copyright restrictions, it is considered the definitive version for English-language readers. For a detailed commentary on Zohn’s translation see de Man (1985). Alternative is Steven Rendall’s translation: “Nonetheless the translation is later than the original, and in the case of the most significant works, which never find their chosen translators in the era in which they are produced, indicates that they have reached the stage of their continuing life [*Fortleben*] (“The Translator’s Task, Walter Benjamin [Translation]: 153).

² Derrida, “Des tours de Babel,” pp. 188.

³ De Man, “Conclusions” 1983: pp. 82.

of world literature, where more often than not the translator goes unnoticed. Translators are almost never seen as the authors of their translations. Rather, they are seen as rewriters of one text in another language who follow closely the semantic and syntactical aspects of the first text and avoid any textual signs that would mark their work as a translated text. Copyright laws alienate translators from their own work and prevent them from exclusively owing it⁴. Publishers and copy editors reinforce fluent and transparent language in translations, the kind of language that would maintain the illusion that readers read the original work in their own language. This is a familiar and often-times overgeneralized picture of the dominant Anglo-American translational scene. It needs to be qualified with detailed case studies especially today when dominant binaries such as author and translator, original and copy, minor and major, center and periphery more than ever shape and control our understanding of distant peoples and their cultures. It is the aim of this dissertation to shed light on these binaries in relation to specific translation case studies.

Definition(s):

I use the word “translation” in its traditional sense as defined by *Oxford English Dictionary* as “the action or process of turning from one language into another; also, the product of this; a version in a different language.”⁵ As any dictionary entry, this one is also insufficient and abstract. It needs to be qualified in relation to a specific case and situation. Based on the case study that I present in the next chapters, I take “translation” to be a complex activity that involves more than just the transfer of one unified meaning of a first text. Signification in one linguistic system never parallels signification in another. Literary texts by their encoded nature

⁴ In Chapter 3 of *The Scandals of Translation* (1998), Lawrence Venuti discusses extensively the dire economic and cultural ramifications of ambiguous copyrights from the standpoint of translators and translations.

⁵ Second edition, 1989; online version June 2011. <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/204844>>; accessed 28 June 2011.

already provide multiple layers of meaning and referentiality. Translation involves a human agent, the translator, who translates under various constraints, and whose interpretation of the first text enables it to continue life in another language and context, where the translated text becomes the basis of new interpretations. In this dissertation, I look at the concept of translation from the translators' point of view.

My view of the concepts of "meaning" and "language" has implications to how I define and use the concept of "translation." Meaning in a text is a site of multiple determinations. As Derrida writes, it is always "defferential and deferred, never present as an original unity" (*Margins of Philosophy* 17). It is subject to endless replacements and substitutions of signifiers. Based on Derrida's definition of meaning, language is the self-contained and closed system of this endless play of signification. Another poststructuralist and hermeneutic explanation of language on which I built in this study comes from Deleuze and Guattari, who define language as an "assemblage" of forms that constitute meaning or "a semiotic regime" (4). These forms acquire meaning relationally, to one another and to various cultural and social institutions. These "assemblages" or forms gain or lose prestige and are hierarchically positioned. According to Deleuze and Guattari, language is historically defined, carries a specific make-up, is inseparable of these constituencies and under the tension of these constraints. These definitions preclude any simple, purely linguistic, and unproblematic definition of a text as an original or a copy, and of translation as a secondary process or product. Benjamin sees translation and original as parts of a larger whole, and celebrates translation as the expression of the essential kinship among languages (77). Translation thus brings the original closer to its fulfillment rather than away from the original. In his essay "Des Tours de Babel" (1985), based on a close reading of Benjamin's

“The Task of the Translator,” Derrida writes that the source text itself is a translation and goes beyond dichotomies such as original and copy.

Ethics

The abolition of the dichotomy between a text and its translation into another language and into another context cannot be understood as the abolition of the ethics that entails translation of cultures. There is a consensus among translation scholars that translation always carries the inscription of the translating language, literature, and culture values⁶. Toury argues that translation is a fact of the target culture “in any event” (*Descriptive Translation Studies* 29). Venuti argues that translation “inevitably perform(s) a work of domestication” (*The Scandals* 5) and that “there is violence that resides in the very purpose and activity of translation: the reconstitution of the foreign text in accordance with values, beliefs and representations that preexist it in the target language” (*The Invisibility* 18). Philip Lewis argues that translation “move(s) whatever meaning it captures from the original into a framework that tends to impose a different set of discursive relations and a different construction of reality” (“The Measure of Translation Effect” in Venuti *Translation Studies* 256). And Berman sees “universals of deformation inherent in translating” (“Translation and the Trials of the Foreign” in Venuti *Translation Studies* 288).

In *Scandals of Translation*, Venuti traces the covered existence of the translator in translations that conform to the canon of fluency and transparency, a practice of concealing the translator under the illusion that the text was originally written in English. The illusion of transparency breaks down when the translator uses a language other than the standard English

⁶ Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*; Venuti, “Introduction” in *Translation and Minority*; Berman, “Translation and the Trials of the Foreign”; Lewis, “The Measure of Translation Effect.”

usage. This transparency is visible, for instance, in early English translations of Russian writers such as Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, and Gogol, who sound alike, and who in turn sound like the German and the French writers translated into English. This reveals the effect of transparency, which in fact is not transparency but the active manipulation of the translator, who subsumes authors from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds to a dominant voice, thereby “domesticating” the foreign element, in Venuti’s terms (*Scandals of Translation* 5). The other possible translation strategy besides “domestication” is “foreignizing.” A foreignizing translation is deliberately opaque, calls attention to itself, and distances the foreign text from the prevailing values of the target culture (189). Venuti promotes foreignizing translation as the necessary ethical position of translators working within the Anglo-American hegemony and that approaches the foreign text with respect for its linguistic and cultural otherness (6). However, when discussing these strategies it is necessary to make concrete the context in which translation takes place. Venuti is working with the Italian language and literature, which are readily available to American readership. When translating from Turkish into English, the strategy of foreignizing would not serve the same end. As Marilyn Booth, who works with the Arabic language and literature, has pointed out, some cultures are already considered foreign, distant, and unavailable to the Anglo-Saxon world, so rather than foreignizing, “the task of creating sympathy and identification with a work and its characters is a particularly urgent one” (199). Similar to the case of translating from Arabic into English, translating from Turkish into English entails careful ethical translation strategies. Further foreignizing the language and the culture of those inhabiting modern day Turkey would be promoting the myth of foreignness and alienness.

Review of Literature

Translation Studies and Cultural Studies

Today, we are far from seeing translation as a literal and mechanical reproduction of the original. Translation has been accepted as a creative act and the translation, as an autonomous text. More and more translators are seen as creative writers on a par with authors and are nominated for awards for their creative work. Essays such as Roland Barthes's "The Death of the Author" (1977 [142-149]) and "From Work to Text" (1977 [255-265]) initiated the rethinking of the authority of the writer by suggesting that the author and the meaning of a text are unrelated. As Barthes points out, "The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centers of culture... [the author's] only power is to mix writings, to counter the ones with the others, in such a way as never to rest on any one of them" (*The Death of the Author* 142). This approach has given precedence to the text over the subject and allowed translations to be considered individual texts rather than secondary copies. In line with this thinking, the status of the translator has been freed from its traditional dependence on the author.

Recent developments in Translation Studies have moved the study of translations away from the search for linguistic equivalents and deviations to the study of translators as agents, their role in translation of cultures, and their ethical responsibilities in a world fraught with asymmetrical relations between peoples, languages, and cultures⁷. In 1976, Andre Levefere proposed what is considered the first manifesto for the emergent discipline of translation studies: "The goal of the discipline is to produce a comprehensive theory which can also be used as a guideline for the production of translations. The theory would gain by being developed along lines of arguments which are neither neopositivist nor hermeneutic in inspiration... and constantly tested by case-histories" (*Translation Studies* 234-5). Although Lefevre

⁷ Apter 2006; essays in Berman and Woods 2005; essays in Simon and St-Pierre 2000; essays in Burdick and Iser 1996; Dingwaney and Carol 1995; Venuti 1992, 1995, 1998; Bassnett and Lefevre 1998; Robinson 1991, Cheyfitz 1991.

acknowledges the importance of individual case studies for the healthy development of the discipline and for avoiding universalizing approaches to translation, the manifesto is prescriptive, aims at establishing universal rules, aspires to be scientific, and does not engage with the asymmetrical linguistic, historical, and cultural relations in which translations operate. Due to its linguistic bases, scientific aspirations, and ethnocentric aspects, translation theory has for a long time relied on assumptions of an egalitarian relationship between distinct languages. Until recently, translation theory has developed via archival and historical research done on European languages and cultures. Consequently, scholars in the field of translation studies in the humanities have based their conclusions on the implications of translations for Western European and U.S. literatures. Only in 1990, Susan Bassnett and Andree Lefevere restated the goal of the discipline in light of later developments, emphasizing the relevance of culture to the discipline: “with the development of Translation Studies as a discipline in its own right, with a methodology that draws on comparatistics and cultural history. Translation has been a major shaping force in the development of world culture and no study of comparative literature can take place without regard to translation” (*Translation, History and Culture* 1990 12).

Simultaneous with the rise of translation studies came the rise of cultural studies⁸. However, due to the Eurocentric foundations of cultural studies, these two disciplines developed without overlapping. However, the parallels and overlaps between these two interdisciplinary fields are significant and cannot be ignored. As this dissertation aims to demonstrate, it is important to go beyond linguistics to recognize the extralinguistic forces involved in text production and circulation. Writers do not write in a vacuum: they are products of a particular cultural, historical, and geopolitical circumstance, and their writings are constrained by factors

⁸ For essays inaugurating the Cultural Studies as a discipline, see. Grossberg, Nelson, and Treichler 1992; for intersections between Cultural Studies and Translation Studies, see Bassnett and Lefevere 1998.

such as language, stylistics, idiosyncratic features, race, ethnicity, gender, age, and class, among others. Similarly, translators translate in a continuum, never in a void, and there are various textual and extra-textual constraints upon them. Nevertheless, the disconnect between translation studies and cultural studies remains. This is mostly because cultural studies, no matter how interdisciplinary it may be, is almost always conducted in one language, that is, English, while translation studies involves two or more languages. This dissertation intends to fill in this gap and demonstrate the benefits of bridging these two fields. It aims to move away from the parochialism of either linguistic or cultural approaches and to show the productive relationship between the local and the global as manifested in and through translations.

The call for cooperation between translation and cultural studies comes mostly from scholars working in comparative and postcolonial critical perspectives. These scholars adopted the terminology of “cultural translation” to address the predicament of writers negotiating concepts of language, culture, and identity in postcolonial context. “Cultural translation,” however, needs careful consideration since it seems to embrace multiplicity of meanings and has often been confused with the concept of “translation of culture.” “Cultural translation” erases the values associated with the concept of translation. For instance, “cultural translation” is a key word in Homi Bhabha’s book *The Location of Culture* (1994), in the chapter titled “How newness enters the world: Postmodern space, postcolonial times and the trials of cultural translation” (212-235). In this chapter Bhabha reads Salman Rushdie’s novel *Satanic Verses* as an example of cultural translation. Rushdie wrote the novel in English and Bhabha reads it in English. That is, the concept of “cultural translation” as used in this context does not involve two languages. Bhabha writes, “The liminality of migrant experience is no less a transitional phenomenon than a translational one” (224), “translation is the performative nature of cultural

communication,” and “cultural translation desacralizes the transparent assumptions of cultural supremacy” (228). Bhabha’s understanding of the word “translation” does not involve literal translation between two different languages. It does not involve two or more texts, either. Rather, what he means is the condition of Western multiculturalism brought about by Third World migrant writers like Rushdie.

This nontextual, nonlinguistic, and metaphoric sense of the word “translation” has become widespread. For instance, the word is under constant interrogation in Tejaswini Niranjana’s book *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism and the Colonial Context* (1992). In this book, Niranjana demonstrates the power-play between British colonizers and Indian subjects by focusing on the word “translation” and its centrality in the Western philosophical discourse. She shows how translation functions as a linguistic figure and is synonymous with “allegory and literature” in Paul de Man’s writings, with “the problematics of representation and intentionality” in Jacques Derrida’s writings, and with the question of “materialist historiography” in Walter Benjamin’s writings (Niranjana 4).

Translation and Postcolonial Studies

To follow from Niranjana’s work on translation and the postcolonial critique mentioned above, “translation” has become a useful term for postcolonial studies due to the self-evident relationship between colonization and translation. The nineteenth century English translation tradition chronicles translation practices that cut, edit, and publish, translations of texts from Arabic, Indian, and Persian languages, supplementing translations with extensive notes in the manner of anthropological study.⁹ In this tradition, translation is only part of an entire textual

⁹ Edward Lane’s translation of *One Thousand and One Nights* and Edward Fitzgerald’s translation of *The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* are the most commonly cited examples in this tradition.

practice of reinforcing a subordinate position of foreign texts and cultures thus facilitating colonization. The colony was often seen as the translation of the empire, a copy of the original located at a distance. As the empires started “writing back,”¹⁰ radical concepts of translation emerged from previous colonies such as India, Latin America, Canada, and Ireland.¹¹ In this sense, postcolonial critique has adopted the concept of translation as a metaphor and key to the technologies of domination while translation studies has opened up to non-European ways of thinking about the concept of translation.

Postcolonial critique has been productive for thinking about translation in relation to present-day power relations. However, today’s global context and the non-colonial nature of domination and exploitation necessitate methodologies other than the traditional ways of thinking about power. The term “postcolonial” has been criticized for its limitations regarding tendencies to universalize its domain without sufficient and rigorous attention to historical, geopolitical, and cultural specificity¹². Postcolonial theories of translation have also adopted the term “empire” to delineate problems related to translating in the context of unequally represented languages and cultures. Because of its historical specificity, “empire” is no longer applicable as an analytical term and today it cannot respond to all situations where unequal power relations are involved¹³. In translation studies, for instance, the ubiquity of postcolonial theory has been criticized by Maria Tymoczko as an approach that “presuppose[s] that colonization can be seen as a sort of ontological condition, rather than reflecting specific historical, economic and cultural

¹⁰ The literary works of former colonies, their subversive nature, and the ways subjugated writers adopt and adapt colonial discourse to assert their own identities are subject of the Ashcroft, B. et al. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Postcolonial Literatures*.

¹¹ For a detailed discussion of the intersections of translation and postcoloniality see essays in the edited volume *Post-colonial Translation* by Bassnett and Trivedi, Cheyfitz, *The Poetics*, Rafael, *Contracting Colonialism*.

¹² For critique of universalizing applications of the term “postcolonial,” see Shohat 1992, McClintock 1992, Dirlik 1994.

¹³ For translation as a postcolonial critique, see Niranjana 1992, Robins 1997, Bassnett and Trivedi 1999, Tymoczko 1999, Cronin 2000.

configurations” (“Translation and Political Engagement” 32). Anticipating the role that translation will play in a transnational and globalized environment, Tymoczko calls on translation studies scholars to develop a terminology and methods that will be relevant “to the larger geopolitical issues pertaining to translation, not just pertinent to colonized peoples or to dominant cultures but adaptable to all political contexts and historical specificities” (40). In relation to this methodological problem, I resist the postcolonial model and avoid tendencies to universalize postcolonial discourse although it may seem applicable to my case studies. Rather, I attempt to interrogate the binary categories of author and translator, original and copy, source and target, major and minor, and center and periphery, which have been heavily marked by Eurocentric notions of power.

Methodological Frame

Relevant to this dissertation are two distinct yet overlapping approaches that have dominated translation studies beyond the linguistic approach to translation: the polysystem paradigm, which sees translations as one system among other literary systems and the school of rewriting, which sees translations as one form of the multiple ways of textual rewriting and manipulation. I supplement these two translation paradigms with the post-structuralist and hermeneutic approach to language and meaning to explain how meaning is generated in translations. Both of the above mentioned translation paradigms also gave way to the most recent hermeneutic approaches to translation by emphasizing aesthetic, cultural, political, and ethical values informing translation practice and research. This is also the result of broadening the scope of Translation Studies by including the findings of related disciplines such as comparative

literary and cultural studies, area studies, history, philosophy, anthropology, sociology, and gender studies.

Initially, the study of translation was subsumed under linguistics, aiming to construct an empirical science and establish a place for the discipline in the academy among other various sciences. John C. Catford's book *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics* (1965) defines translation as comprising a "substitution of TL (i.e. Target Language) meaning for SL (Source Language) meanings" (32). This is based on a mechanistic approach to language. It explains translation as a communication of objective information. Within this approach, success of translation is evaluated on typologies of equivalence, disregarding any question of function and context beyond communication. This approach assumes that translation activity takes place between equal planes. However, the asymmetrical relationship between languages maintains itself most clearly as English continues to dominate as a source language. Although the purely linguistic approach to translation is mostly irrelevant today, it was for a long time the paradigm for the specific reasons I lay out next.

The assumption of the equality between languages originated with and has been reinforced and maintained by the development of bilingual dictionaries, grammar books, and text books for language learning. These learning materials are based on an understanding of translation as a word-for-word transfer between languages. Success in foreign language learning classrooms is measured by quantifiable accuracy in translation. However, it is necessary to distinguish between translating in order to demonstrate competence in a new language and translating literary texts in the sense of decoding and re-encoding literary and cultural

signifiers¹⁴. Still today, the same terminology is used for both activities. In the seventeenth century, changes in mass production of books and the emergence of a new market of readers meant that the production of literary texts and translations rapidly increased. To meet the demands of the market, those translations were often made at speed and by people with minimal competence. During the age of European Empires, translation was produced exclusively for the consumption of the colonizer. Missionaries translated the Bible for purpose of conversion. Translation was a means of creating and enunciating the subjectivity of the colonized, perpetrating orientalist prejudices¹⁵. That is, there is an ambiguity caused by the use of the same term to describe a pedagogic instrument, hack work for mass markets, a means of subjugating others, and a high-status literary activity. This is also why there are conflicting feelings about the activity of translation, its practitioners, and its products.

Going beyond Linguistics and with the growing understanding of languages as products and effects of culture, today literary translation is understood as a complex negotiation between two cultures. Within this understanding, the unit of translation cannot be taken as a word, a sentence, a paragraph, a page, or even a text anymore. The whole language and culture in which the text emerged came to be taken as a unit. This is often referred to as “the cultural turn in Translation Studies,” which liberated translation from exclusively linguistic approaches (Bassnett and Lefevere, *Translation, History and Culture* 1990). In addition today, translation studies is seen as a separate unity from comparative literary studies. Although translation has been central to Comparative Literary Studies and contributed to the evolution of the discipline, translation has remained “under-analyzed” and “under-theorized” within this discipline (Ungar

¹⁴ Translation studies scholar Gideon Toury makes a convincing argument that, for the purposes of research, one needs to distinguish between the concepts of “literary translation” and “translating literature” (*Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* 164-168). Here, I use the term “translating literature.”

¹⁵ Edward Said’s *Orientalism* (1977) and *Culture and Imperialism* (1994) provide ample examples of this.

127). Similar to how postcolonial studies changed the course of literary studies in English, translation studies has taken on the methodological concerns of Comparative Literary Studies. Today, comparative studies of literature across languages have become the subject matter of Translation Studies (Bassnett *Comparative Literature* 47).

Beyond the Linguistics paradigm and Comparative Literary Studies, the polysystem approach and the school of rewriting relevant to this dissertation, take translation as an object of study in relation to socio-cultural parameters. Polysystem Studies scholars, such as Gideon Toury, Jose Lambert, Maria Tymoczko, Susan Bassnett, and Andre Lefevere have adopted a “descriptive, target-oriented, functional, and systemic” approach to the study of translations (Hermans *The Manipulation of Literature* 13). They privilege descriptions of the target-language and culture inscriptions in the translation, explaining translations on the basis of social functions and effects. This approach challenges theories of equivalence. It dismantles the notion of the primacy of the original and the secondary status of the translation. As I discussed above, the most obvious problem with the assumption of equivalence between two languages is that it overlooks the existence of hierarchies between source and target texts and cultures. Polysystem theory, on the contrary, purports that systems are never identically positioned, and that notions of the superiority or inferiority of a text or of a literary system are always in play. Polysystem scholars are less interested in how closely the translation resembles the original. Rather, they are more interested in what a translation says about the culture surrounding it and how well it fulfills its goal in that context.¹⁶ Certainly, the limitation of the polysystem theory is that it adopts notions such as “source” and “target,” “superior” and “inferior,” “minor” and “major,” and re-

¹⁶ Examples of the polysystemic and descriptive approach to translation include Theo Hermans’ study of prefaces and introductions of Renaissance translators working in English, French, and Dutch and their use of metaphors to describe their works (103-135) and Andre Lefevere’s study of the process of canonization of translations in Germany (215-243).

produces what are only linguistic constructs. Also, this approach is limited to descriptions of translations and leaves unaddressed questions of the ethical responsibility and agency of the translator in relation to translating between asymmetrical contexts.

The second approach relevant to this discussion is the school of rewriting and manipulation. Borrowing and building on the polysystem approach, scholars taking this position conceive of translation as one of many forms of text production, reproduction, rewriting, circulation, and manipulation. This approach brings about concepts of plurality and the idea of the original is challenged from multiple angles. An early proponent of this school, Andre Lefevere argues that translation is only one of the multiple ways of rewriting literature (Lefevere *Translation, Rewriting, and Manipulation of Literary Fame* 1992). In his persuasive essay “Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites?” Lefevere addresses the problem of translation as another form of rewriting among various literary activities and textual practices such as interpretation, criticism, historiography, and the putting together of anthologies (233). Translation, like other forms of rewriting, is subject to the manipulation of what Lefevere calls literary “patrons” and the dominant literary ideology or “poetics,” all of which struggle for supremacy. In this sense, patrons are peoples and institutions that promote or prevent the writing, reading, and rewriting of literature. According to this view, the interaction of writing and rewriting makes possible the canonization of certain works, genres, authors, and literatures while relegating others to oblivion (233).

The most significant and relevant aspect of post-structuralist approach to translations and to this study is that it shifts attention away from the author and original to the translated text, to the process of translation as a creative act, and to translators as creative writers and agents. This shift is most evident in studies such as Douglas Robinson’s *The Translator’s Turn* (1991) and

Lawrence Venuti's *The Translator's Invisibility* (1995). Robinson's argument is underlined by the idea of the translator's subjectivity, proposing a "somatic" foundation for translation theory, recognizing the translator's subjective engagement with the text and language. Robinson argues that the Bible translation model "has largely been the case in Western translation theory" (xvi). This argument is based on the study of classical and European canonical texts and their translations. All the examples are taken entirely from Greek, Latin, and European canonical sources. In this sense, this argument is limited to West-West translation paradigms. It needs to be supplemented by and rethought in the light of alternative translation paradigms such as East-West and South-South translations.

In addition, the concept of the "Western translator" in Robinson's argument is problematic. It is based on the writer's survey of translation history and eschews close reading and specific examples. This argument is reductive and inadequate to how translators see and position themselves vis-à-vis the author and the language into which they translate. Translators are necessarily bilingual and by extension, bi-cultural. Not all translators translate into their native languages, Güneli Gün being the primary example in this dissertation, which calls for reformulation of traditional theories on translators' position. Translators are not static. They move between languages and geographies. Their positionality as translators changes vis-à-vis the language into which they translate. The direction of their translation flows unpredictably and problematizes concepts such as "source" and "target" languages. Translation case studies like the ones I provide in the pages to follow valorize established binaries and call attention to the diversity of the post-imperial situation. The end of the colonial era may have produced and reinforced nation-state approaches and binaries such as East and West, and South and North. Globalization and transnational cultural and commodity flow, on the other hand, trigger us to see

the internal unity and homogeneity of these binaries. Translation and the asymmetrical relations in which it takes place allow us to see beyond established terminologies and paradigms.

Robinson's argument is weakened further when he reduces translators' textual and linguistic choices and their decision making process to "somatics" or "idiosomatic programming." He argues that translators "feel words," that their choices are guided by an instinctual gut feeling: "We do feel words, and most typically guide our choices of words... by recourse not to an abstract cognitive system of rules but to what feels right" (xii). The value of Robinson's study is in his exclusive focus on the translator as a subjective human being, exactly what the polysystem approach and school of manipulation have overlooked. However, Robinson reduces the complex decision making process and the ethical position translators occupy to body instincts and "somatically inscribed ideology" (xii). His argument leaves unaddressed issues and pressures generated by authors, publishers, translation contracts, and the translator's preoccupation as creative writers, independent from the author. Reducing translation to somatic explanations precludes any ethical stance translation entails as a means of negotiating cultural signifiers.

Similarly, Lawrence Venuti in *The Translator's Invisibility* (1995) focuses on the translator. Yet, Venuti has an entirely different take on the state of the translator in the Anglo-American context. Venuti provides close reading and critical examination of translation practices from the seventeenth century to the present, to show how fluency prevailed over other translation strategies to shape the canon of world literature in English. Venuti uses the term "invisibility" to describe the translators' situation and activity in contemporary Anglo-American culture. Building on Schleiermacher, Venuti identifies two translation strategies: translators either "domesticate," what Schleiermacher calls bringing the author to the reader, or "foreignize," what

Schleiermacher describes as leaving the author in peace and taking the reader to the author. Venuti argues that since World War II, Anglo-American translators predominantly adopted domesticating as a translation strategy. According to Venuti, translators domesticate the foreign element, adopting a fluent discourse, and maintain the illusion of transparency. Venuti's second book, *The Scandals of Translation* (1998), moves one step further from describing the contemporary situation of translators and addresses the ethics of translation. This time, building on Antoine Berman's concept of ethics of difference¹⁷, Venuti argues for translation projects that "foreignize" and thus go against the cultural hegemony at "home." Venuti calls for "minoritizing" translation projects, urging that "translations be written, read, and evaluated with greater respect for linguistic and cultural difference" (*The Scandals of Translation* 6). Venuti is provocative and his arguments are convincing. Yet, the polar positioning of the terms "foreignizing" and "domesticating," "major" and "minor," "Anglo-American/English" and "foreign" in this book are problematic. These binaries reduce the heterogeneity and alterity that exist at the heart of any literary text, translation, and language. It is not uncommon to come across translations which carry both of these characteristics. In other words, it is impossible to categorize a translated text based on the terminology of "foreignizing translation" or "domesticating translation" unless we have adequate criteria for differentiating between these two categories. As Maria Tymoczko pointed out, "any translation procedure can become a tool for cultural colonization, even foreignizing translation" ("Translation and Political Engagement" 35). Not all domesticating strategies result in a fluent text and not all foreignizing strategies result in a resistant translation. These outcomes depend on and are determined by the specific cultural context in which and against which the translation is produced. For instance, in the

¹⁷ Antoine Berman develops the concepts of "the recognition of the foreign" and "ethics of difference" in his book *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany* (1992). He begins from the standpoint of translation being a means of dialogue with other cultures.

chapters to follow, I demonstrate how the two English translations of *The Black Book* by Güneli Gün and Maureen Freely point to the linguistic alterity within one and the same language: English. Elements such as the domestication of the foreign and the foreignizing of the domestic in these translations can only be identified by pointing to how these strategies relate to or deviate from the context in which the translations emerged. Moreover, each translation is an example of cultural negotiation with varying degrees of domesticating and foreignizing. These case studies demonstrate that foreignizing and domesticating can be regarded as functionally equivalent ways of accommodating linguistic difference.

My study follows on the polysystem approach and investigates the translations as “facts of the target literary system” (Toury *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* 24). I agree with the polysystem scholars’ general postulate that translation is a sign of the openness of the target system to another literary system. In this sense, translation fills in a gap and fulfills a function in that system. The study of translation in relation to other literary systems allows us to account for literary systems other than the European ones. Translations are key texts in this regard since they are produced on the borderline between two languages, literatures, and cultures. By accounting for literatures in terms of dynamic literary systems in interaction with one another through translation, this approach is an alternative to Eurocentric notions of studying the literary phenomena. At the same time and contrary to polysystem scholars, I do not discard the source text, language, and culture at any time, especially because my study addresses translations from Turkish into English and German, and engages with the ethical aspects of what happens when a text is translated across the purported “East” and “West” divide. I qualify the overgeneralized understanding of the Anglo-American translational market, a powerful center, as being closed to translations from Turkish, a minor literature, by pointing to the high demand and

interest in translating Orhan Pamuk's novels. Clearly, the awarding of the Nobel Prize for literature to Pamuk in 2006 is central to my argument.

Building on Lefevere's concepts of rewriting and manipulation, I see translations as products of a set of interrelated elements that either promote or prevent translation. This approach redefines translation as an activity produced in relation to various agents and constraints. It goes beyond aesthetic considerations to unveil material conditions. It obviates the multiplicity of ways literature offers its knowledge to us. However here, I focus exclusively on translators as rewriters. I suggest that translations need to be studied as, within, and in relation to the translators' other creative works. I contend that a complete understanding of the translations could only come when translations are seen as stages in translators' own career as writers, when the literary and stylistic peculiarities of the texts are explained in relation to the translators' own unique styles, literary preoccupation, and position vis-à-vis the author and the translating language. Close study of the translations reveals that translators sometimes submit to and sometimes challenge the expectations of the target literary system by creating a hybrid text. Sometimes, translators are in agreement and work together with the editor; sometimes, they have to negotiate with powerful editors and publishers; and at other times, they cooperate with their demands. In addition, in reading translations one needs to consider closely the powerful persona of authors such as Orhan Pamuk. Especially after the Nobel Prize, Pamuk became extremely conscious of his image abroad.¹⁸ As a result, he began to monitor the English translations of his novels, to change translators, and to supervise the entire process of translating. Networks operating on translations do not stop there. Translated texts are reviewed by book reviewers who, more often than not, do not have the language skills to read original versions. Reviewers often

¹⁸ Arguably, Pamuk has often times been commented on as being one Turkish author, extremely preoccupied with his image abroad and who writes with an international audience in mind, see. Ertürk, p. 663.

comment on translations as if they were the original text. Reviewers pass value judgments, and exercise power to relegate a translation to the status of an “unworthy copy” or convince a writer of the unworthiness of the translator’s toil.

Another limitation of Lefevere’s approach is that it views the translator not as an individual agent, who makes unique and subjective decisions, but as a victim and object of others’ manipulations, among them patrons and ideologies. My case study reformulates the concept of the translator as a rewriter by addressing her creative translational decisions as attempts of linguistic, cultural, and contextual negotiations. In addition, Lefevere sees authors as innocent and submissive, at the mercy of literary agents and subject to the translators’ “manipulations” (238). My study, on the contrary, demonstrates the changing and increasing power of the author in relation to translation production, translator commissioning, and in influencing translation practices. For instance, Lefevere writes:

In many cases [writers] have long been dead, in most they have precious little say in the matter. Writers are powerless to control the rewriting of their work, which may be a bad thing... if the writer does not ‘submit,’ he or she will simply not exist in the receiving literature at all... new translations tend to be made with the aim of revealing him or her on his or her own terms to the receiving literature, and no longer on terms dictated by the receiving literature itself. (236)

This statement is based on the view that the translator as the rewriter of the text has exclusive power and control over the translation. This might have been the case when translators acted as agents of writers on the receiving end, in early modern times. However, today the traditional power of the translator is overtaken by or shared with authors, who most of the time can read the translation, especially if it is in English. Translator’s “exclusive” power over the translation is

also limited by editors, who favor fluent discourse and compliance with predominant values of the receiving literary system, and by publishers, whose concern is to increase sales. At the same time, as I demonstrate in subsequent chapters, the interference and newly assumed power of the author over the translation process and product do not necessarily always bring about positive results.

Writers like Orhan Pamuk, who acquired prestige in literary circles and command of the translating language, exercise enormous power over the translator and translation. Often times, such writers select the translator or choose to change translators. These writers can choose to work closely with the translator and screen the translation. They authorize significant changes, alterations, and omissions in the text or openly ask the translator to change her style. They impose pressure through translation contracts and demand speedy translations in order to accelerate sales. These authors have the power to choose among publishers and editors.¹⁹ These conditions are not available to all writers and literatures. These conditions problematize any assumption of clear-cut distinctions between minor vs. major literatures and writers, centers versus peripheries, powerful authors vs. weak translators or vice versa and call for detailed case studies in relation to the contexts and conditions that, give rise to them. This relates to another of Lefevere's statements regarding translators and the limits of their power as rewriters. Lefevere writes that translation is:

Potentially –and often actively- subversive, precisely because it offers a cover for the translator to go against the dominant constraints of his or her time, not in his or her own name ... but rather in the name of, and relying on the authority of a writer who is considered great enough in another literature so as not to be ignored in one's own, at least

¹⁹ I provide detailed explanations of these points with relevant examples in the chapters to follow.

not if one wants to safeguard that literature against provincialism and other forms of atrophy. (238)

In the Anglo-American context, the translator's "subversive"-ness depends on multiplicity of factors. It also depends on the source language and the prestige of that language in the target context. In cases where the author is alive, has a command of the translating language, and exercises certain power over the translation, Lefevere's statements fail to explain the elements that impact the translation process and product. His statement also conflicts with Venuti's argument that translators tend to obliterate themselves by adopting fluent discourse, which maintains the illusion that the translation is not a translation but an original (*The Translator's Invisibility* 1995). This disagreement between the two scholars results because of the differences in their objects of analyses. While Lefevere's arguments are based on his study of classical and canonical texts and their strong-willed translators, who were most of the time writers themselves, Venuti's arguments are based on the study of translations produced in global context, where multiple agents control the production and circulation of texts and the will of the translator is often subject to these forces.

It is impossible to talk about a conscious subversion on the part of the translator independent from other factors that control the translation. This also reveals the weakest aspects of the systems approach: it assumes a unified, homogenous, and static notion of a system. Although Lefevere accounts for various agents controlling text production and in his essay "Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System, and Refraction in a Theory of Literature" (1982) shows how different agents, times, and literary tastes produce ideologically distinct translations of the same text, his theory is rigid, categorical, and meant to account for the optimum. Categories such as the "translator," "patrons," and "universe of discourse" are at times

impossible to control and account for because they come to us entangled.²⁰ As useful as they are, sociological approaches to literary phenomena need to be balanced with close analyses of the texts themselves. Finally, Levefere's literary history and small number of literary analyses are limited to texts taken from the Greek, Latin, French, and German languages. In an attempt to limit the literary provincialism of his study, he includes a number of examples from Chinese, Arabic, Afro-English, and Dutch literatures. Yet, these are very limited and call for a deeper engagement with non-Western literary histories and smaller Western literatures.

As Andre Lefevere has aptly pointed out in his book *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, “rewriters adapt, manipulate the originals they work with to some extent, usually to make them fit in with the dominant, or one of the dominant ideological and poetological currents of their time” (8). Today, in the category of world literature, readers do not read texts as written by their writers, but as rewritten by their translators. When general as well as professional readers say they have read a book or know an author, what they mean is that they have a certain image of that work or author, a certain construct. In the case of foreign literature in translation, that construct is based on a long chain of mediations that culminate in a translation. Translation is one of the most obvious and yet complex forms of rewriting. It is powerful because it is able to project the image of an author and his works in another language and culture, removing that author and his works from their original culture. Translations create images of writers and their works that exist side by side with the realities they represent but the images tend to reach more people than the corresponding realities do. The study of images that were created based on translations is significant since it illuminates the networks of relations that

²⁰ Cognizant of this limitation, Lefevere at one point writes that “the categories that a system approach makes use of are formulated in some kind of “inertial frame,” similar to the ideal world physicists postulate” (“Mother Courage” 244). However, in his book length study of rewriting and manipulation, literary history dominates against literary analysis and case studies (see *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, 1992).

give rise to them and precludes any romantic explanation of text and culture production. I adopt the concept of rewriting for the purposes of this study since the concept directly tackles questions such as who rewrites, why, under what circumstances, and for which audience. Treating translation as a form of rewriting allows us to see how translation and the field of literature are closely related to and cannot be conceived independently from social and material realities.

The category of rewriters includes not only the translators but also the editors. Copy editors exercise significant role in textual rewriting, as Andre Lefevere has discussed in the above-mentioned book. However, Lefevere's discussion on editing is limited only to general book editing. Editing and publishing of translations, especially of translation of non-European languages and some of the minor European literature is a problematic and neglected area of study. It is especially so since editors rewrite texts without having the language skills to read the original. Moreover, Lefevere has discussed the manipulative power of rewriters mostly around "advantageous" languages such as Greek, Latin, French, and German with small number of examples from Chinese, Arabic, and some other non-Western literatures. The work of rewriters, such as translators, involves ethical issues not addressed by Lefevere especially when the project of translation is conducted as a "humanistic enterprise" to serve as a bridge between "equal" languages.

Today, world literature and the ways in which it is defined, constituted, anthologized, and taught in Europe and in the United States comprise all the literatures that were written in languages other than English²¹. British and American literatures are not commonly conceived as world literature. In this sense, the concept of world literature is ethnocentric in its reference to "other" literatures, and viewed through a certain lens of perceived notions. The concept of world

²¹ In Turkey, for instance, the term world literature is used to refer to the literatures of Europe and the Americas. This discrepancy in reference brings in questions of positionality and thwarts any attempt to discuss world literary phenomena without temporal and spatial contextualization and historicity.

literature signifies market forces, points to today's transnational circulation of texts, and represents the tendency to internationalize Anglo-American curricula. In the Anglo-American setting, world literature is received in the form of English translation, the language of the economically and culturally dominant superpower, which adds an additional level to its fraught nature.²²

Translators, Visible and Invisible

Essays written by some translators more often than not reveal strong voices of the individual translators²³. They share in shunning translation theory and academic approaches to translation; their contributions are informal and autobiographical, concerned with showing creativity, scholarship, and linguistic expertise necessary to fulfill the responsibilities of the translation business, and almost always in agreement about the art of writing and translating. They are uniformly in agreement with their ownership of the resulting text, which they argue must stand on its own as “an English text.”

One translator contribution among them stands out and this is Anthea Bell's argument. Contrary to more radical and liberal translation theories, Bell expresses her yearning for the clear, transparent pane of glass through which to translate the foreign text:

Translators are in the business of spinning an illusion. The illusion is that the reader is reading not a translation but the real thing ... In presenting a foreign text in English I would wish it to pass the language barrier as if seen through that perfectly clear,

²² For a thorough discussion of the place of translation in world literature, see Casanova, *World Republic of Letters*; Prendergast, *Debating World Literature*; Kumar, *World Bank Literature*; Apter, *Translation Zone*.

²³ Edited volumes such as *The Translator as Writer*, eds. Susan Bassnett and Peter Bush; *Translators through History*, eds. Jean Delisle and Judith Woodsworth; and *Translators on Translating*, ed. Andrew Wilson supply ample examples.

transparent pane of glass, but I'm well aware that a translation is more likely to resemble the pane with the slight distortions. ("Betray, Domesticate, or Negotiate?" 59)

Bell is in favor of maintaining the suspension of disbelief that the reader reads somebody else's texts. The translator, she argues, is not licensed to offer a bold, provocatively new interpretation of the original text. She aims to accomplish perfection in translation, to produce a translation that is the mirror image of the original in a new language. As a translator, Bell challenges herself to high linguistic and literary standards in order to be able to "spin the illusion." She wants the readers "to feel that they are getting the real book, as close as possible to the original" (62). She is clearly in disagreement with the foreignizing and minoritizing agenda that Venuti proposes when she writes,

A good, easy English style, obvious as it may sound, is one way to ensure that a translation is easily acceptable as a work in its own right, not a feeble imitation of the original. To me, this is far more important than whether a theoretical case is made for the obtrusion into a translated version of difficulties arising from the original. ... The fact is, there are commercial considerations to be taken into account, and I have every sympathy with a publisher's desire not to lose too much money on a book. I imagine, too, that translated authors would like their books to sell, and will not mind at all if they read naturally in English. (65)

Bell aims for an acceptable and unobstructed text, which sells abroad. The commercial success of the translation is her priority and her agenda is in line with those of the original writer and the publisher. Certainly, the fact that Bell translates from German into English is a factor in how she perceives translation. Among general Anglo-American readership, German literature is seen as being underlined by serious and philosophical subject matter and sarcastic humor. Bell's

argument clearly intends to put this general assumption at ease by creating readable texts. This approach presents a stark contrast to Venuti's argument for foreignizing translation and minoritizing approach. The argument over visible and invisible translators derives from rhetorical debates. It is more about the status of translations and the power of translators than the practice itself.

Historically, translators have always also been writers and poets and vice versa. Their invisibility was not a question at all. Rather, it was expected from writers and poets of considerable stance to practice the art of translation. Some of the best-known ones are the British poets John Dryden and Dante Gabriel Rossetti, the German men of letters Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and Arthur Schopenhauer, the Russian and American novelist Vladimir Nabokov, the American poet Ezra Pound, the Mexican Nobel laureate Octavio Paz, the Argentinian writer Jorge Luis Borges, and the French poets Yves Bonnefoy and Paul Valery. The invisibility of the translator is a recent practice. It originated simultaneously with the romantic idea of the uniqueness and originality of a literary text and with the special status attributed to the author as the creator of that text. This idea inevitably relegates the translation to the status of a secondary copy and the translator to mechanical reproducer of the original. The invisibility of the translator as fostered by fluent discourse in translations serves the purpose of producing the illusion that the text is the original, a prestigious artifact and not a copy.

Today, the historical figure La Malinche, Cortes's mistress and interpreter, stands for translators (von Flotow *Translation and Gender* 74). She is the Janus-face of translators. One version presents her as the noble Indian woman, who lived with Cortes and put translation in the service of bridging the linguistic and cultural gap between her own people and that of her lover's. Another version presents her as betraying her people to the invaders, providing the

linguistic bridge necessary for them to devastate Mexican civilization. Yet a third version sees her as the victim of oppression, compelled to serve the colonial master, forced to act as the unwilling intermediary in the larger process of subjugation and violation of a society. That is, she is simultaneously the helpmate, the betrayer, and the helpless victim. Clearly, a successful translator is one who balances and negotiates these multiple and at times conflicting roles.

Orhan Pamuk and Turkish Literature

As is well known, the number of translations, literary or non-literary, from European languages into Turkish is very high compared to translations from Turkish into other languages. That is, there is a constant flow in and consumption of the foreign in Turkey. This also determines the amount of studies conducted in this line. Most studies on translation and Turkish literature look at translations from European languages into Turkish and explain how these translations accommodate or subvert dominant norms in Turkey. Since translated Turkish literature into English –and to a lesser degree- in German is limited, studies on Turkish literature are done mostly by Turkish studies scholars in an attempt to illuminate the wide variety of literary production in Turkish and how it relates to its cultural, historical, and political context.

Pamuk is a writer whose literary work, public life, and global distribution have raised difficult questions about the sometimes fraught relationship of intellectuals to both global audience and those in their home nation. In Turkey, he is glorified by some as a cultural hero and bitterly attacked by others for not being sufficiently loyal to his nation. Abroad, he is idealized as a “cosmopolitan writer,” who transcends his home country and is often mistakenly taken as a representative of all literary production in Turkish. Pamuk’s novels reveal complex games of identity and identifications; twinning, doubling, and duplications; their central characters are

troubled siblings, relatives, rivals, doppelgängers, and mimics; their thematic considerations present, question, and trouble the relationship between self and other, original and copy, the authentic and the counterfeit. At a deeper level, Pamuk problematizes the historical evolution of Turkish language, history, and culture while he insightfully presents this evolution as a part and parcel of global relations. His novels reveal cultural specificity that is skillfully presented through the eyes of others. They are translations and back translations.

In line with this, then, it is the aim of this dissertation, a study of Pamuk's *Kara Kitap* and its two English and one German translations, to reach an understanding of the novel as a literary artifact and to establish its relationship to one mode of reproduction and circulation: translation. Translations facilitate the circulation of the novel as well as the culture it is assumed to represent. The focus here is the work of the translators as creative writers and culture ambassadors. I provide close readings of translations to demonstrate how translations are the translators' creative works, whose translational decisions are not independent from translation patrons such as the intended audience, the publishers and editors, and at times, the author himself. Often times, those "gate-keepers" are ignored and the power they exert on text production and circulation is not stressed enough. It is, therefore, the purpose of this study to highlight those aspects of text production that are refracted in the translations.

Translation scholars often remark on the role of the translator as an ambassador of cultures. While comparative literature scholars acknowledge the role translation played in the dissemination and circulation of Pamuk's works abroad, they tend to assert the primacy of reading the originals and often provide their own translations although "official" translations of these works do exist. Scholars of Turkish literature and Orhan Pamuk often discuss the reception and function of Turkish literature and Pamuk at home and abroad. No student of literature and

translation has yet undertaken a close examination of Pamuk's translators' role in shaping his image and reception abroad. This dissertation attempts to close the gap between translation studies and literary and cultural studies in relation to Pamuk's image as a cosmopolitan author.

Chapter Outline

Chapter 1 consists of two parts. In part 1, through close readings of reviews, articles, interviews, and book-length manuscripts, I examine the reception of Orhan Pamuk in Turkey and abroad. In part 2, I read Pamuk's *Kara Kitap*, paying close attention to particular images, intertextual and metatextual aspects, and shifts in narrative voice. I choose elements of the novel that are self-referential and language-, context-, and culture-specific. Translation of these particular elements reveals the translators' literary and stylistic idiosyncrasies and how each translator recontextualized the text in unique ways. In Chapter 2, I focus on the translator Güneli Gün and identify her unique style as a writer. I argue that Gün's primary purpose as a translator was to perform a bridging role between Turkish and American literatures and cultures and to introduce Pamuk to western readers before he reached international fame. In Chapter 3, I focus on Maureen Freely, who is widely known as Pamuk's definitive English translator since the Nobel Prize. I analyze her translations, novels, and journalistic writings in order to determine her idiosyncratic style and position as the author of the new translation of *The Black Book*. I argue that Freely translated the novel in ways that bolstered Pamuk's more recent image as "the writer of the city of Istanbul." In Chapter 4, I focus on Ingrid Iren, Pamuk's German translator. I read her translation, *Das schwarze Buch*, in relation to the larger cultural issues that bear upon Turkish-to-German translation, such as the legacy of *Gastarbeiterliteratur* in Germany and the "Turkish turn" in German literary and cultural studies. I argue that German literary and cultural

studies are incomplete unless the translator is acknowledged as a creative writer and cross-cultural communicator, shaping the German literary canon. The conclusion points to avenues for future research.

Chapter 1: Orhan Pamuk's *Kara Kitap* (1990)

I could not bring *The Black Book* to a close ... because they would not understand this book that was becoming steadily stranger, because they would measure it against traditional novels, because it was hard to understand, because they would point to the book's more obscure parts to prove it a failure, and also, perhaps, because I was never going to finish it; I'd written the wrong book.

—Pamuk, *Other Colors*

This chapter consists of two parts. In part 1, through close analysis of a sampling of book reviews of *The Black Book*, I offer an overview of the general discourse employed in translation reviews. In part 2, I offer an overview of the reception of *Kara Kitap* in Turkey and background information about the novel and its author. I provide analysis of the Turkish text, paying close attention to linguistic, stylistic, and thematic aspects; characterization; its intertextuality with the masterworks of the Middle Eastern literary tradition; its metatextual aspects; and shifts in narrative voice. I choose elements of the novel that are self-referential and language-, context-, and culture-specific. Translation of these elements of the original reveals the translators' literary and stylistic idiosyncrasies, and how each translator recontextualized the text in unique ways, which I discuss in detail in subsequent chapters.

The reception of the English translations is problematic. It reveals how book reviewers who read the novel in translation assume that they read the original text. They consistently avoid discussing the text as a translation and do not acknowledge the translator. Basic issues related to translations such as accuracy, intended audience, its economic value in the current book market, the translation's relation to the literary trends in the target literary system or its place in the translators' career are left unaddressed. Negative reviews of the text are based on a certain assumption of what a Turkish novel should be. Reviewers often comment on what is problematic

or absent from the text, thereby employing a position of judgment and superiority. Positive reviews, on the other hand, praise literary and stylistic aspects of the text, attributing these elements to the original author.

Lawrence Venuti argues that the translator in contemporary book reviews is “invisible” (*The Translator’s Invisibility* 1). A sampling of book reviews of Pamuk’s *The Black Book* translated by Güneli Gün and Maureen Freely demonstrates that, in fact, the translator *is* visible. She is visible in the sense that she has left her unique stylistic and idiosyncratic signature on the translation by recreating the original text’s overall effect and allusions to other works of world literature. Moreover, she is visible in the sense that the reviewers are able to spot these literary elements in the translation and to comment on them in their reviews. I qualify Venuti’s argument by demonstrating that the translator and any discussion of the text as a translation are *absent* from translation reviews. This, I suggest, is because reviewers assume that they read Pamuk’s language and style in translation; they assume that the translation is a transparent medium that transfers meaning across languages effortlessly and unproblematically.

Edward Said’s Concept of “Critical Consciousness” as a Method of Reading Translations

In his essay “Traveling Theory,” Edward Said discusses how, like people and ideas, schools of criticism and theories travel across time and place. This circulation sustains and nourishes cultural exchange and intellectual activity. However, as Said is quick to point out, theories and ideas might gain or lose strength by virtue of moving from one place and time to another. A theory in one national situation or historical period might entirely change when applied to another situation and period. In Said’s words, “Such movement into a new environment is never unimpeded. It necessarily involves processes of representation and

institutionalization different from those at the point of origin. This complicates any account of the transplantation, transference, circulation, and commerce of theories and ideas” (*The World, the Text, and the Critic* 226). Although Said does not discuss translations, both the process of translation and cultural representations that travel through translations could be viewed and understood within the same conceptual framework that Said discusses in this essay.

First, there is a set of circumstances in which a literary text originates, is given birth, or enters the canon of a national literary repertoire. Second, when translated into another language, there is a linguistic and cultural distance traversed, a passage through the force of various contexts as the text moves from one point in time to another, from one geographical space to another, where it comes into a new visibility, both linguistic and cultural. Third, there is a set of linguistic and cultural conditions both accepting and resisting the original text that confront the text, making possible its introduction or toleration, however welcoming or alienating it might be. In addition, the translated text, fully or partially accepted, accommodated, or incorporated, is necessarily transformed by its new position in time, place, language, and reception. There is a babel of arguments for the limitations of translations, of ideologies that proclaim the eternal yet determinate value of an original text. At the same time, it is impossible to entirely discard translations. They exist; every day new titles appear in translation, and classical and canonical texts receive new translations that are shelved in bookstores side by side with previous ones. In this context, how do we read and understand translations? The concept of “critical consciousness” that Said discusses in the essay mentioned above provides us with a lens to read and study translations (247). It allows us to remain skeptical and critical, succumbing neither to the dogmatism of easy translatability nor to the sulky gloom of impossible translation. Translations are useful for our understanding of the relationship between social reality, its textual

representation, its refraction in other languages, and how a dominant yet hermetic critical discourse about other peoples and cultures emerge based on a limited understanding of translations, of their production, circulation, and reception.

Working with translated texts necessitates locating and situating the original in the translation, and reading the leftover or the residue against the new linguistic and cultural context. This way, the source text can be measured against subsequent times and places where the original turns up for use. The way I apply Said's concept of "critical consciousness" to the study of translations begins with the abandonment of two interconnected positions. One is that literature is fundamentally autobiographical and its meaning is related to the circumstances of the individual author. The second is the view that literature is the expression of a nationality or a national character. Nothing more than translations and the circumstances in which translations come into being belies these two positions. Translations are the results of the interaction of multiplicity of networks and heterogeneity of voices, all of which culminate in the translated text. This aspect of translations is entirely left out from book reviews.

Book Review as a Genre

Writing for PEN American Center newsletter, Ronald Christ describes the prevailing practice of literary journalism and translation review: "Many newspapers, such as *The Los Angeles Times*, do not even list the translators in headnotes to reviews, reviewers often fail to mention that a book is a translation (while quoting from the text as though it were written in English), and publishers almost uniformly exclude translators from book covers and advertisement" (8). In his sampling of book reviews over the past fifty years, Venuti identifies a pattern of reviews praising fluent discourse in translations while condemning deviations from it

(*The Translator's Invisibility* 2). Venuti comments on the cultural ramifications of this practice thus: "The translator's invisibility is symptomatic of a complacency in Anglo-American relations with cultural others, a complacency that can be described—without too much exaggeration—as imperialistic abroad and xenophobic at home" (17). Considered side by side, these two views connect the literary and the cultural in the Anglo-American context. And yet, how much can we expect from book reviews and popular literary criticism?

The scholar Antoine Compagnon comments that literary criticism "proceeds by sympathy (or empathy), by identification and projection. Its ideal site is the salon, and the press is one avatar, not the university" (*Literature, Theory, and Common Sense* 9). That is, the addressee of literary criticism is the interested and informed reader and not the specialized researcher. This is the value of book reviews and their difference from literary theory, which is a more reflexive and philosophical mode of studying literary texts and their writers. In light of this view, the domain of book reviews in popular media, in Sunday supplements of daily newspapers, in cultural journals, and on the Web is problematic: book reviews lack specificity, are ambiguous and confusing, and supply erroneous information. The genre of review does not meet the criteria of literary criticism even though reviewers speculate on the texts' effects on the readers and act as judges of taste by evaluating, appreciating, or depreciating a work of literature. Translation reviewers demonstrate lack of knowledge of the original language and culture. Their reviews are confusing when they do not clearly indicate that they review a book in translation or when they do not acknowledge the translator. Translation theory, on the other hand, is limited in regards to what constitutes translation review and translation criticism and does not provide clear guidelines as to how the genre of translation review should be performed. In this chapter, I contend that there is a need for a clear distinction between what constitutes a book review and a translation

review. Reviewing translations as a separate genre and acknowledging the translator as the writer of the translation allows us to go beyond treating translations as transparent copies of originals and translators as invisible. Reviewing translations as translations would necessarily call for acknowledging the literatures written in languages other than English.

Translated and appropriated, texts often are taken to be keys to understanding others. Translations are insidious in that they blind readers devoted to the Platonic idea of “originality” and dull critical consciousness, convincing readers that once a work of original culture, the translation is still a work of the same culture, if not a source for and representation of a national character. Translating Said’s concept of “critical consciousness” into the study of translations is to measure the distance between one text and its translation, between there and here, between then and now. It is to see in translations the encounter of one language with another, one culture with another, one writer with another. It is to move skeptically between texts and reflect critically on the problem of representation. Lack of understanding what constitutes originals and translations and how they are produced and circulate risks adding up to already established common cultural dogmas about other literatures, peoples, and cultures.

Background to Translations

Kara Kitap (*The Black Book* or *The Dark Book*) was first translated into English as *The Black Book* by Güneli Gün. It was published in the United States in 1990 by Farrar, Straus, and Giroux and in the United Kingdom in 1995 by Farber and Farber. The new translation of the novel by Maureen Freely was published in 2006 by Vintage International. After *Beyaz Kale* (1985; *The White Castle* [1990]), *The Black Book* was Pamuk’s second novel to be translated into English. *The White Castle* was translated by Victoria Rowe Holbrook and was first

published in the United Kingdom by Carcanet Press. This is significant because *The White Castle* was the first literary text to introduced Pamuk to English-speaking readers and set the tone for reviews and expectations for subsequent novels. *Beyaz Kale* is ostensibly a historical novel, set in the seventeenth-century Ottoman capital city, a fable of identity exchange between an Italian slave and his Ottoman master, fulfilling and eventually subverting a Hegelian master-slave dialectic.²⁴ Following is a passage from Holbrook's translation of *The White Castle*, demonstrating the style of the text:

Till the break of day I talked with him about what I'd left behind in my country, told him how he could find my house, spoke of my mother, my father, my brother and sister, how we were regarded in Empoli and Florence. I mentioned some tiny, special particulars by which he could know one person from another. As I spoke I recalled that I had told him all of these things before, down to the large mole on my little brother's back. At times, while entertaining the sovereign, or now while writing this book, these stories have seemed to me mere reflections of my fantasies, not the truth, but then I believed them: my sister's stutter was real, as were the many buttons on our clothes and the things I had seen from the window overlooking the garden behind our house. Towards morning I began to think I had been seduced by these stories because I believed they would continue, perhaps from where they left off, even if much later. I knew that Hodja too was thinking the same thing, that he happily believed in his own story.

We exchanged clothes without haste and without speaking. I gave him my ring and the medallion I'd managed to keep from him all these years. (Pamuk, *The White Castle* 144–45)

²⁴ For a discussion on publication and translation issues surrounding *The White Castle*, cf. Shaw's "The Gatekeepers' Price."

Holbrook's translation carries a British accent in an astringently unadorned style. Word choices such as "break of day," "speak of my mother" "special particulars," "entertaining" "sovereign," "reflection," "stutter," "haste," and "medallion" resonate with the British accent and creates the effect of an elevated and grave narrative voice. This is balanced by occasional contractions of words and use of colloquialism such as "tiny" and "mere." The translator opts for pithy sentences that are free from embellishments and avoids ornate language or complicated syntax. The effect is a clear and fluent language, which does not attract attention to itself as rhetoric; instead, it carries forth the plot and allows for immersion in the story. The translation is an accurate rendition of the original text. This is how the English-speaking world came to know Orhan Pamuk: a Turkish writer, writing in plain and clear style, experimenting with postmodern themes of unstable and interchangeable identities, and questioning the commonly accepted east-west dichotomies. As Pamuk's first novel in English translation, it became definitive as to how the subsequent translations of *The Black Book* and *The New Life* would be received.

Critics lavished praise on Holbrook's translation (Parini 3; Updike, "Vagueness on Wheels" 102–51; Altınel 1990; Gün, "Being Oneself and Another" 1991; Halman, "Ottoman Shadow Theater" 1991). Negative reviews came mostly from readers, who could not read Pamuk's earlier novel, *Sessiz Ev* (*The Silent House*), and could not follow the allusion *The White Castle* makes to that novel. The preface of *The White Castle* is written by the fictional character and historian Faruk Darvınoğlu (the historian of *The Silent House*) and the novel is dedicated to his sister Nilgün. In "The Melancholy Life," an interview with Pamuk, the author expressed his satisfaction with this translation and translator (Stocke n.p.). Although Pamuk was content working with Holbrook, by the time he finished writing *Kara Kitap*, she had taken a tenure-track

position at Ohio State University and did not have time to translate a new book. She recommended her friend Güneli Gün for the new translation.

In addition to *The Black Book*, Güneli Gün also translated *The New Life (Yeni Hayat)*, Pamuk's fifth novel and third to be translated into English. She received negative reviews from British critics, complaining that her use of idiomatic and colloquial American English in *The Black Book* and *The New Life* was inappropriate.²⁵ Later in this chapter, I discuss in detail the linguistic, stylistic, thematic, intertextual, metatextual, contextual, and narrative aspects of the original text, *Kara Kitap*. I devote chapter 2 exclusively to Güneli Gün's translation of *The Black Book*. Here, I quote a random passage from *The Black Book* in order to compare with the quote from Holbrook's translation of *The White Castle*:

He wanted to explore in full sunlight the willows, the acacias, the climbing roses in the enclosed garden of Rüya's tranquil sleep. Shamefully apprehensive of the faces he met there: You here too? Well, then hello! Along with the unsavory memories he expected, registering with curiosity and anguish the unexpected male shadows: Beg your pardon, fella, but just when and where did you meet my wife? Why, three years ago at your place; in the pages of a foreign fashion magazine bought at Aladdin's store; at the middle school you both attended; at the foyer of the movie theater where you two stood holding hands... No, no, perhaps Rüya's head was not this crowded and this cruel; perhaps, in the only sunny corner of her dark garden of memory, Rüya and Galip might have, just now, embarked on a boatride.

A few months after Rüya's folks moved to Istanbul, Galip and Rüya had both come down with the mumps. In those days either Galip's mom, or Rüya's beautiful

²⁵ Especially reviews written by Ronald Wright (*TLS*), Alev Adil (*TLS International Books of the Year*), Adam Mars-Jones (*The Observer*), Brian Martin (*The Financial Time*), and Katy Emck (*The New Statesman*) on *The New Life* are noteworthy. For a detailed reference cf. the Works Cited list of this dissertation.

mother Aunt Suzan, or both, leading Galip and Rüya by the hand, would take them on buses that jiggled along the cobbled streets to Bebek or to Tarabya where they'd go on boatrides. Those days, it was the germs that were redoubtable, not the medications; it was believed that clean Bosphorus air could alleviate the mumps. Mornings, the water was calm, the rowboat white, the boatman always the same and matey. (Pamuk, *The Black Book* 3–4)

This excerpt is sufficient to reveal Gün's characteristic style in her translation of the *The Black Book*. Her translation is rendered in a predominantly American idiomatic language. That is, she chose to express meaning in a way that sounds natural to American readers. Words and phrases such as "You here too? Well, then hello!" "Beg your pardon, fella," "Rüya's folks," "come down with the mumps," "mom," "buses that jiggled along the cobbled streets," "germs that were redoubtable" are colloquial, conversational, and informal. Expressions such as "to explore in full sunlight the willows, the acacias, the climbing roses in the enclosed garden of Rüya's tranquil sleep," "shamefully apprehensive," "unsavory memories," "registering with curiosity and anguish," "unexpected male shadows," "the only sunny corner of her dark garden of memory," "embarked on a boatride" are in parallel with Pamuk's baroque and flamboyant Turkish in the original *Kara Kitap*. Gün captures the reflective psyche of the characters of the original text with "no, no, perhaps," "You here too?" "but just when and where did you meet my wife?" Gün accomplishes and even excels in the literary technique of stream of consciousness when she presents the thoughts and feelings of the characters as they occur: "Beg your pardon, fella, but just when and where did you meet my wife? Why, three years ago at your place; in the pages of a foreign fashion magazine bought at Aladdin's store; at the middle school you both attended; at the foyer of the movie theater where you two stood holding hands...." At the same time, she is

eloquent and poetic—“the water was calm, the rowboat white, the boatman always the same and matey”—and elliptical and suggestive with phrases such as “the enclosed garden of Rüya’s tranquil sleep,” “sunny corner of her dark garden of memory.” Her translation is sensitive to sound, music, alliteration, and assonance (“crowded and cruel,” “buses that jiggled along the cobbled streets”) while expressions such as “to alleviate the mumps” are signs of the nonnative writer’s careful precision. In this translation, Gün boldly meets the challenges of matching Pamuk’s long, complex, and at times tiring sentences without being grandiloquent and ornate. Similarly, she experiments boldly with semantic and syntactic structures that are not commonly found in fiction or everyday American usage.

Below, for instance, is an example of Gün’s translation of one of Pamuk’s extremely long sentences in the *The Black Book*:

Other things could be found on the repulsive basement floor that was encrusted with dirt a lot worse than manure: shells of pigeon eggs stolen by mice who went up the spouts to the upper stories, unlucky forks and odd socks that had slipped from flower-print tablecloths and sleepy bedsheets shaken out the windows and fallen into the petroleum-colored void, knives, dust cloths, cigarette butts, shards of glass and lightbulbs and mirrors, rusty bed springs, armless pink dolls that still batted their plastic eyelashes hopelessly yet stubbornly, pages of some compromising magazine and newsprint that had carefully been torn into tiny pieces, busted balls, soiled children’s underpants, horrifying photographs that had been ripped to shreds...

At times the doorman went from flat to flat showing one of these objects, which he held up by the corner in disgust as if he were taking around a criminal for identification, but the inhabitants in the building would not own up to any suspect articles

that returned unexpectedly out of the slime of the nether world: “Not ours,” they’d say.

“Fell down there, did it?” (181)²⁶

Gün’s translation is a herculean accomplishment rendering Pamuk’s long sentences not only with accuracy but also with similar intensity and effect: Gün’s sentence is wordy, circuitous, and carries on the long list of objects piling the apartment airshaft without omitting any slight detail. Once again, word choices and expressions like “encrusted with dirt a lot worse than manure,” “unlucky forks and odd socks,” “sleepy bedsheets,” “petroleum-colored void,” “dolls that still batted their plastic eyelashes hopelessly yet stubbornly,” “compromising magazine,” “busted balls,” and “suspect articles” carry Gün’s characteristic signature of an unruly writer.

When Holbrook and Gün’s translations are placed side by side, the differences in linguistic, stylistic, and literary choices become clear: There are two different Englishes involved as well as two opposite styles. When compared to Gün’s translation, Holbrook’s stands out as fluent, readable, and straightforward. Holbrook’s sentences are short, succinct, pithy, and epigrammatic. Considered together, her syntactical and lexical choices give the effect of an historian narrating the story in retrospect. She opts for vocabulary that matches the first meaning of Pamuk’s words. Gün, on the other hand, opts for vocabulary that is literary, poetic, suggestive, and allusive. Gün’s choice of language and style matches with the task of narrating the mental state of the characters in *The Black Book*. Difference in language is difference in effect: While

²⁶ “Gübre bile denilemeyecek bir pislikle kaplı bu iğrenç zeminde başka şeyler de bulunurdu: Yağmur oluklarından üst katlara çıkan farelerin çalıp aşağı attıkları güvercin yumurtalarının kabukları, çiçekli masa örtülerinin ve uykulu yatak çarşafarının içinden nefli boşluğa düşmüş talihsiz çatal ve bıçaklar, çorap tekleri, toz bezleri, sigara izmaritleri, cam, ampul ve ayna kırıkları, paslı somya yayları, plastik kirpikli gözlerini umutsuzluk ve inatla hala açıp kapayan kolsuz pembe bebekler, küçük parçalara ayrılarak dikkatle yırtılmış bazı şüpheli dergi ve gazete sayfaları, patlak topraklar, kirli çocuk donları, parçalanmış korkutucu fotoğraflar...”

Arada bir, kapıcı, bir ucundan tiksintiyle tuttuğu bu nesnelerden birini kimliği teşhis edilecek bir suçlu gibi kat kat dolaştırırdı, ama apartmanda yaşayanlar öteki dünyanın çamurundan beklenmedik bir günde kapılarına geri dönen bu şüpheli nesneleri sahiplenmezlerdi: “bizim değil,” derlerdi. “Oraya mi düşmüş?” (Pamuk *Kara Kitap* 205).

Holbrook's text reads fluently and thus creates the illusion of transparency as if Pamuk wrote it in English, Gün's translation calls attention to itself as nonstandard English, verbose, demanding, difficult to read, and uncommon. *The White Castle* employs progressive narrative while in *The Black Book*, chapters narrating the story are interrupted by chapters of dark and apocalyptic newspaper columns.

Book reviews favored *The White Castle* while they found problems with Gün's translation. They evaluated the translations of *The Black Book* and *The New Life* based on their perception of the linguistic and stylistic characteristics of *The White Castle*. It did not occur to them that they were reacting to the stylistic idiosyncrasies of two different translators even though both novels were written by the same author. Naturally, two different translators have two distinct agendas of writing, two different perceptions of the function of the text in new context, and two different readerships in mind (one British, the other American) even though the language in question is English. Reviewers assumed that since it was the same writer behind the translations, they should read similarly. They did not even consider the possibility that the writer might have employed different styles in the two novels.

Reviewers judged and dismissed Gün's translation based on what they deemed to be an inappropriate language and style for a Turkish novel in translation. In particular, British reviewers found the American English to be jarring and too "slangy," revealing their impatience with "another" English (Wright 1997). Translating for Carcanet, a British publisher, Holbrook's translation was edited by a British editor and intended for British readers²⁷ while an American translator, Gün, employed American English. This small yet significant detail reveals the role publishers and editors play in the formation of the final product before it reaches the reader.

²⁷ For a detailed case study of this translation, see Shaw.

***The Black Book* in Book Reviews**

Book reviews of Pamuk's *The Black Book* reveal an alternative picture of the author before he was awarded the Nobel Prize. Also, they are a telling picture of the general discourse dominating translation reviews of Turkish and non-English literature in translation. The most dominant characteristic that I identify in these book reviews is the discourse and attitude of Orientalism. Edward Said discusses and analyzes Orientalism "as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient—dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it" (*Orientalism* 2). This discourse enables and justifies subjugating, dominating, and ruling over the Orient. Orientalist discourse is based on the assumption that there are ontological and epistemological distinctions between the East and the West, the Orient and the Occident, the Middle East on the one hand and Europe and America on the other. Said's Orientalism is based on his study of the British and French colonial and cultural enterprise during the colonial era. Since World War II, the United States has been the most dominant economic and cultural power, making decisions not only in the Middle East but globally. This is directly manifested in the cultural dominance of the English language as it continues to be the primary source language for translations worldwide. The position and attitude of superiority is also characteristic of how Anglo-American writers and book reviewers read and review translations of books written in the languages of the Middle East.

A close study of book reviews of *The Black Book* published in the United States and United Kingdom reveals that reviewers assume fundamental distinctions between Western and Turkish literatures. There is an expectation of what Turkish literature in translation should be. Any deviation from this expectation is negatively reviewed and the text is deemed lacking. If acknowledged at all, the translator is the suspect of any shortcomings of the text or blamed as

such. Underlying these reviews is an attitude of superiority coupled with lack of knowledge, understanding, and interest in the actual book being reviewed, its author, and the original language. Almost always, the book is reviewed in relation to Western or globally well-known authors and the novel is judged using European literary yardsticks. Compared to literary giants' writings and reviewed with already accepted measures, the text is deemed insufficient. I content that assuming textual transparency of translations reveals reviewers' preconceived notions and expectations of the text, reinforces the translators' invisibility, and perpetuates misunderstanding of translation production and text circulation.

Critique of Book Reviews

My reading of this reception is based on a sampling of book reviews, published in various newspapers, literary journals, and Internet sources in the United States and United Kingdom. This selection is by no means exhaustive. My choice of samples is characteristic of the discourse and attitudes of book reviews of *The Black Book*.

In the most recent review of the new translation of *The Black Book* (2006) by Maureen Freely, the acclaimed journalist and writer Scott McLemee writes,

Whether or not hüzn is the essence of Turkey (and I wouldn't know, having never been), it is certainly the key to understanding Pamuk's novel *The Black Book*, which has just appeared in English for a second time. The earlier rendition, published in 1994, suffered from an archness of diction and uncertainty of tone that never let you forget it was a translation.

It appears that Pamuk has now found his authorized and definitive translator in Maureen Freely, a novelist who is also a longtime friend. Freely also put *Istanbul* into English. Each book stands on its own. But the author has indicated that *The Black Book*

was his effort to do for Istanbul what James Joyce did in *Ulysses* for Dublin, so that Pamuk's later meditations on hüzn and the city often feel like a detailed commentary on the novel. (2006 n.p.)

McLemee welcomes the new translation while he voices his dissatisfaction with Gün's translation to a point where he calls it a "rendition." McLemee dislikes Gün's vocabulary and its overall effect on the text. His reading experience was incomplete and interrupted because Gün's translation constantly calls attention to itself as a translation. He would have preferred a translation that reads fluently and maintains the illusion of transparency. Freely is the favored translator because she is authorized by the author and works closely with him on translations. She is also a novelist herself.

This reviewer does not have the skill to read the original text, and yet he comments on the inappropriateness of Gün's vocabulary and tone. One is tempted to ask how he arrived at this judgment. Possible questions such as the reasons behind the differences in translations, the intended readership, the place of the translations in each translator's career, or how the translations relate to contemporary literary and market trends are left unaddressed. Instead, Gün's translation is dismissed based on an over-general comment, the "archness of diction and uncertainty of tone," which homogenizes otherwise an extremely dynamic and hybrid text. The translation is not seen as the translator's interpretation of the original, as one possibility among many, or as a response to the immediate context in which it was translated and published. Instead, it is expected to freeze the original text in timelessness, to carry universality, and to address all times and all readers with equal force. Freely's translation is deemed better because she is authorized by Pamuk and she is a novelist. Underlying this approach is the Platonic idea of the originality and uniqueness of the first text and the authority of the first writer. Being a

novelist is seen to be to Freely's advantage as a translator. It does not occur to McLemee that Gün is a novelist, too.

McLemee lavishes praise on the new translator while his review of the novel itself is negative. He compares *The Black Book* to Borges' works and concludes that Pamuk is not as good. It is not clear from McLemee's comment whether he reads Borges in Spanish or in translation and what exactly he compares under the names Pamuk and Borges. The only saving grace of the novel, he writes, is the setting, the city of Istanbul, which recalls Kafka, Joyce, Proust, Mann, and Calvino. As I discuss in chapter 3, it is Freely's translation, different from Gün's and Iren's, that places a specific emphasis on the city both as a result of her nostalgic relation to the city where she grew up and in line with Pamuk's late image as the "writer of the City." The reviewer goes on to comment on stylistic aspects of the translation, attributing everything to the author and failing to consider how the translator might have had rewritten those aspects. Finally, McLemee expresses his desire to penetrate the city of Istanbul and find something culture specific in the novel and thus asks, "how much this is Turkish" (2006). It does not occur to McLemee that *The Black Book* is a work of fiction in translation, thus subject to double mediation away from something essentially "Turkish."

In his book review "Tales of the City," Robert Irwin, the British historian, novelist, and writer, reviews *The Black Book* for the *Times Literary Supplement* and expresses a similar wish to access the essence of the city of Istanbul (1995, 21). Irwin treats the novel as a travel guide and as a means to reach the culture and its history. The city is seen as a metaphor for Turkey and the novel as a source of the country's realities. Irwin comments in detail on the style of the translation and assumes that it is a transparent copy of Pamuk's style. Even though Irwin mentions that Güneli Gün translated the novel, he does not discuss the text as a translation or its

implications as a translation. After a detailed discussion of the stylistic aspects of the (English) text, Irwin writes, “Istanbul is an apocalyptic city, whose inhabitants wait for a Messiah who will bear His cabalistic (that is literary) credentials written in His face” (1995 21). As I demonstrate in detail in chapter 2, it is Gün’s diction and stylistic choices that recreate the image of the city with Christian and apocalyptic overtones. Irwin quotes from the English translation extensively, qualifies the style as “stately and dense,” and attributes these qualities to Pamuk. When this and subsequent reviews are viewed in the light of the analysis of Gün’s translation that I present in the next chapter, the inadequacy and often misleading nature of these reviews become clearer.

Irwin sees similarities between the themes in *The Black Book* and the thematic preoccupations of the British writer Thomas de Quincey. Also, Irwin identifies similarities between the *The Black Book* and Paul Auster’s *New York Trilogy*. It does not occur to Irwin that it is not Pamuk but Gün’s manner of rewriting the novel that gives rise to these associations. Pamuk writes in Turkish while de Quincey in British English and Auster in American English. It would not have been possible for Irwin to find these similarities if he had read *The Black Book* in Turkish. It is impossible to discuss thematic and stylistic aspects of a literary work independently from the language in which it was written. Irwin concludes his review thus: “*The Black Book* is little disappointing, for it fails to deliver the conventional satisfactions. It should really be read as an encyclopedia of esoterica and as a compendium of medieval and modern literary tricks. As such, it is quite wonderful” (1995, 21). This statement makes it clear that Irwin’s yardstick in evaluating the novel is exclusively Anglo-American, which defines what provides and fulfills “the conventional satisfaction” in a novel.

Under the title “Istanbul not Constantinople,” referring—in a tongue-in-cheek manner—to the popular lyric of the same title, John Brenkman contributes further to the Orientalist

discourse about the novel and its setting. Similar to Irwin's comments about the imagery of the city in the novel, Brenkman, too, identifies "apocalyptic tones" in the translation (1995 n.p.). After quoting from Gün's translation extensively and commenting on the stylistic aspects of the text, Brenkman concludes, "The stylistic choices of *The Black Book* suggest a larger ambition" (1995 n.p.). This is an example of how reviewers quote from the translation and attribute stylistic choices to the author. In addition, reviewers often comment on *The Black Book*'s language with ambiguous and vague adjectives, that is, "suggest a larger ambition" in this review ("uncertainty of tone" in McLemee's review above), which are neither informative nor descriptive of the text. This I see as symptomatic of reviewers' anxiety of reading a text in translation and not being able to tell whether what they read belongs to the author or to the translator.

A revealing example of this is Jonathan Coe's review for the British paper *The Guardian*. Coe begins his review with the following comment: "The slippery, equivocal texture of Orhan Pamuk's second novel . . . is a reflection both of its literary aesthetics and of the modern Istanbul where the story is set" (n.p.). Coe goes on to characterize the text as a "sly, generous, rueful humanity" and "both complete and unsettling" (n.p.). First of all, Coe commits a factual mistake by calling *The Black Book* Pamuk's second novel. *The Black Book* is Pamuk's fourth novel—but the second to appear in English translation. Texts that have not been translated into English do not register in the minds of Anglo-American reviewers and are treated as if they did not exist. This also indicates the reviewer's lack of knowledge and interest in the author under review. Second, nowhere in this review does Coe mention that he reads a translation or does he acknowledge the translator. Yet he comments on the quality and aesthetic aspects of the text

extensively and attributes these qualities to the author, Pamuk.²⁸ Coe's choice of adjectives—"slippery," "equivocal," "sly," "generous," "rueful"—is problematic. These adjectives are neither descriptive of the text nor informative. At most, they are ambiguous and ambivalent, which I see, once again, as the monolingual reader's anxiety of not being able to register with certainty whether this is the original text or a translation. Furthermore, Coe compares the *The Black Book* to Eco's *Foucault's Pendulum*, Auster's *New York Trilogy*, Kundera's *Immortality*, Tim Winton's *The Riders*, Milorad Pavic's *Landscape Painted with Tea*, and Francisco Goldman's *The Long Night of White Chicken*. It is not clear from this review what exactly Coe compares: style, plot, theme, genre, character development, etc. This reviewer glosses over a significant linguistic detail: that Pamuk writes in Turkish, Eco in Italian, Auster and Goldman in American English, Kundera in Czech, Pavic in Serbo-Croatian, and Winton in Australian English. Coe's comparison involves multiple languages and thus, multiple translators, whose names are absent from his review.

Translated texts by nature are twice mediated and moved further away from reality and from their immediate context. Reviewers fail to acknowledge this essential quality of translated texts. The "invisibility" of translators and translations is reinforced by reviewers who avoid discussing the text as a translation and dismiss the translator. Oftentimes, the *The Black Book* is reviewed as a window to a distant land and culture, and a source of factual information about Turkey and its people. Phrased this way, the review becomes an example of orientalizing and essentialist discourse about Turkey. The temporal and spatial settings of Pamuk's *The Black Book* are not verifiable realities. They are results of the author's "vision of the present projected backward" (Seyhan 149). They are mediated and recontextualized through the translator's

²⁸ Even though most of the reviewers do not mention the name of the translator, it is possible to identify which translation they address from the date of the reviews, from the quotes they use, and from how they type the name "Celal." Gün transliterates the name as "Jelal" while Freely leaves it as "Celal."

rewriting of the original for a new audience, which always entails a measure of lack or loss as well as alternative gains, which I discuss in more detail in subsequent chapters.

Writing for the *Los Angeles Times*, Richard Eder titles his review as “In the Land of the Defeated and Oppressed, to Be Is to Be Someone Else.” He comments on the stylistic aspects of the novel thus:

Elaborated with a dizzying wealth of discursiveness, distraction, and literary baiting and switching, it often bogs down under its own abundance. It will dazzle and then, with an effect akin to snow-blindness, it goes indistinct. It disappears into its own virtuosity and reappears. It remains distant from the reader like someone who talks fast and well and doesn't look you in the eye, and suddenly, with disconcerting effect, looks you in the eye.

It is a trying book and worth trying. (1994 BR3)

As the title of the review and the quote above reveal, Eder reviews not only the literary aspects of the book but also the land from which it comes. The land is described in terms of turmoil and struggle, where identity issues are contested. Eder's title is a quote from the novel from one of the character Celal's newspaper columns, where Celal comments sarcastically on the contemporary situation of the country, pointing to Turkey's historical development as the root of modern-day conditions. Eder, however, quotes only a segment of the entire passage. Thus removed from its immediate context, and made the title of a book review in an American newspaper, changes the entire frame in which these words are interpreted. As one critic has pointed out, “The problem of Pamuk's reception itself (nationally and internationally) [is] fundamentally a problem of representation” (Ertürk 634). Any reading of Pamuk's novels requires understanding of the author's investment in international literary circles. Pamuk's novels project a message with international readership in mind. That is, the author often gives the

readers what they want to hear. This necessarily brings the limits of essentialist comments such as Eder's above. In Eder's review, the land remains "distant from the reader" and is narrated "with a dizzying wealth of discursiveness, distraction, and literary biting and switching" (1994 BR3). The text and, by extension, the people of the land don't "look you in the eye," a common stereotype of people of the Middle East for whom avoiding direct eye contact demonstrates humility while in the western context avoiding eye contact is interpreted as a lack of honesty and straightforwardness. In this review, the land of *The Black Book* is alien and oppressed, and its language gibberish and unintelligible. By treating the translation as the actual words of the author and a reflection of reality, Eder fails to provide an adequate understanding of what constitutes a translation, a literary text, and its interpretation.

Similarly, reviewer Charlotte Innes, unable to identify *The Black Book*'s intertextual references to Sufi mysticism, comments on Hurufism, one thematic stream in the novel, as "an obscure, fourteen century sect that believed we could find the origin of being in letters written on our faces" (1995 425). This reviewer's lack of knowledge of the subject matter serves only to reveal ignorance and lack of interest in other religious and mystical traditions. This, however, is phrased in discourse of superiority over others. The orientaling discourse in this review goes on when Innes comments that "Pamuk is suggesting that there are as many ways of seeing and describing life as there are, say, rugs in a mosque. Beneath the truth lies another. And like the rugs, these truths, these stories, may look different" (1995 425). This review reduces a complex novel to basic stereotypes about the Middle East such as "rugs in a mosque" and builds on exoticisms such as *The Arabian Nights* and Aladdin's lamp. Nowhere in her review does Innes mention that she reads the text in translation.

Bill Max's review "Two Worlds: Turkey's East-West tension spins out narrative arabesque" adds further to orientalizing discussions of the novel and commits factual mistakes (1995 n.p.). The title reduces the country to a world split between two polar opposites. It is a source of literary texts that are "arabesque," that is, stylistically ornate, elaborate, intricate, and "Arabian in fantasy." The implication is that a land of turmoil such as Turkey generates texts attractive and appealing to Western readers. This reviewer mistakenly writes that the city of Istanbul, the setting of the novel, is the capital of the country. He does not indicate that he reads a text in translation. Instead, he finds it more significant to reveal his disappointment with the lack of eroticism in the novel: "The novel's Borgesian solipsism weakens its celebration of the connections between the imagination and the world, one culture and another. Rüya is more of a device than a character, there's no erotic heat propelling Galip's quest, which makes his identity crisis unnecessarily theoretical. Still, *The Black Book* is prestidigitation of a high order" (1995 n.p.). In my analysis of the novel below, I discuss in detail the implications of the character Rüya. She is meant to be ephemeral and an illusion, and as such, fulfills a function in the overall interpretation of the novel. Max's inability to demonstrate a coherent interpretation of the text leads him to reveal his own expectations, that the novel is not sensual enough and lacking in eroticism.

Close attention to the vocabulary employed by these reviewers reveals their anxiety over working with a text they understand only partially. Some of them mention that they address a work in translation although the name of the translator is often left out. If they include the name of the translator, they do not discuss the translator as a rewriter and interpreter of the text. It is assumed that the translator's text transparently reveals Pamuk's text and style. Statements such as the following indicate that the reviewer could not generate a meaningful interpretation: "there

is something familiar about its urgent, almost hypnotic narrative” or “written in deliberately befogging, serpentine sentence” (Innes 1995 425), “*The Black Book* expands these concerns and works through the gamut of post-modernity ... an identifiable set of formal assumptions, which still remain curiously distant” (Mannes-Abbott, 1995 41), and “the wonderfully macabre imagery the novel abounds in ... a peculiar Turkish maze with an uneasy, shifting foundation” (McGrath, 1995 X06). I read these vague statements as signs of the reviewers’ anxiety of not being able to tell whether they read Pamuk’s language or that of the translator’s.

In particular, this anxiety predominates in the reviewers’ discussions of stylistics. To treat a translated text as revealing the writer’s style is to assume unequivocally that the translation is a transparent medium. It is to assume that the translators have no style at all or that their styles disappear or become indistinguishable from the style of the original author. Individual translators have their own literary styles, a quality that is impossible to avoid. Bakhtin defines style as the relationship of “discourse to its object, to the speaker himself and to another’s discourse” (“Discourse” 378). In analysis of the novelistic discourse, it is impossible to separate discourse and its object, form and content, and language and its subject matter. Style is a unique and a characteristic mode of expression and carries the translator’s signature in the translated text. In fact, as I argue in subsequent chapters, familiarity with the translators’ own creative writing serves better to explain the translators’ translational decisions in regards to syntax, lexis, and register than knowledge of the source text or the original author’s style.

Book reviewers assume that they experience Pamuk’s unique style in translations. This assumption is complicated further when reviewers compare the style they spot in translations with the style of other authors, whom they also read in translation. For instance, Charlotte Innes compares *The Black Book*’s stylistic qualities with those of Calvino, Winterson, Gass, and

Borges, concluding that “Pamuk is more dangerous” because “the teasing, impish spirit is Pamuk’s own” (1995, 425). Another example is Guy Mannes-Abbott’s comment on Pamuk’s stylistic progress from *The White Castle* to *The Black Book*, dismissing the fact that, as I pointed out above, the two novels were translated by two different translators with extremely different stylistic choices and intended for different readers (1995 n.p.).

Another example of the problems and inaccuracies arising from ignoring the translator is Patrick McGrath’s review:

This is symptomatic of a general malaise of repetitiveness in the novel, which tends to clog the narrative and weary the reader. Language itself is discovered to be not what it seems but is instead alive with hidden figures like the logogriph, a word chain formed on the first and last syllables of sentences or a sentence formed from the first and last words in paragraphs. ... This is certainly the feeling one has on emerging from this great knot of a novel. Still, *The Black Book* offers many pleasures, Gothic, Borgesian and other. (1995)

This reviewer finds problems with repetitiveness in the text. Pamuk’s original is rather repetitive as I demonstrate in the chapters to follow. Gün considerably eased this repetitiveness in her translation by employing synonyms and by opting for words with Latin and German roots. At the same time, as this reviewer suggests, language as a medium and its limits is one of the themes explored in the novel. The author’s choice to be repetitive should be explained in relation to his thematic preoccupation. Pamuk explores the limits of language as a medium by reference to the Hurufi sect of Sufism, which this reviewer glosses over with the word “logogriphs.” The repetitiveness McGrath identifies in this translation could be explained with reference to the different linguistic structures of the Turkish and English languages: the difference in the usage of the pronoun “I.” Followed by a verb, when “ben” (meaning “I” in Turkish) repeats in the Turkish

text, it is a sign of the writer's conscious choice to emphasize it for a purpose and effect. In Turkish, a highly inflected language, the declension of the verb signals the subject and makes the usage and repetition of the subject "ben" ("I") unnecessary as a rule. This is not the case in English. In English, one has to use "I" as a grammatical rule and a linguistic requirement. Another way to explain this is a back translation from English into Turkish, when the translator is unsure whether to render the "I" as "ben" or to leave it to the declension to do the work. This is why McGrath find this particular section of the translation repetitive while the original is not.

Another reviewer who does not mention the name of the translator and does not discuss the text as a translation is Joan Smith, writing for *The Independent* (1995 n. p.). First of all, Smith commits a factual mistake when she writes that there are "three authors in search of a body" (1995 n.p.). One of the "three authors" she identifies is the translator Gün, who now and then enters the text and comments on things. In the original text, the narrative point of view shifts only between the third-person narrator and Celal, who writes the newspaper columns. The search entails two bodies, Rüya's and Celal's. Smith appropriately comments that the search is not only physical but also textual and intellectual. She identifies various intertextual and metatextual references and allusions in the text. These qualities of the translations carry the translator's signature. A literal translation of the novel would not have had accomplished these literary tricks. The translator succeeded in recreating the literary allusions and association of the original through literary and stylistic devices that are not necessarily the same as those in the original and yet create a similar effect. This reviewer was able to identify them and yet fail to acknowledge them as the work of the translator.

Smith comments on the stylistic aspects of the text, assuming that they reflect Pamuk's style. She writes, "Galip begins to question his unthinking hero-worship of his older cousin and a

vital component of his own identity is undermined; the fact that the threat of disintegration existed long before his wife's disappearance is signaled by a simple linguistic device, the revelation that her name, Rüya, is also the Turkish word for 'dream'" (1995 n. p.). This is one of the most obvious examples of problems related to book reviews, which avoid discussing the text as a translation. In the Turkish text, the meaning of the name Rüya ("dream") is clear to any Turkish reader. There is no need for the author to "reveal" the meaning of the name. When the proper name "Rüya" is rendered as "Rüya" in the translation, the double meaning and suggestiveness of the name is lost. To recover the loss, Gün inserts a paragraph-long section (which I discuss in detail in chapter 2) in order to reveal the meaning of the Turkish names Rüya, Galip, and Celal, the three main characters in the novel. Smith's review is an apt example of how limited literary commentary is when it avoids discussing the text under review as a translation and the translator as its creative rewriter.

The writer Susan Miron writes a positive review of *The Black Book* under the title "A Turkish Novelist Makes a Breakthrough" (1995 n.p.) She praises the novel highly, quotes passages from it, and commends Pamuk for what he has accomplished with the simple plot of a quest. She comments on how the aesthetics and stylistics of the novel contribute to the "the hypnotically alluring tales written by Jelal" (1995 n.p.). She identifies echoes of various genre associations in the translation: "*The Black Book* slithers through a dizzying maze of genres—detective story, political and historical commentary, parable and fable" (1995 n.p.). Like the reviewers discussed above, she compares the novelist to other writers: "Pamuk here brings to mind Lewis Carroll cross-pollinated with a Turkish mutation of Philip Roth at this postmodern wackiest" (1995 n. p.). However, never even once does Miron mention that she reads a text in translation, written by a translator capable of recreating the novel in aesthetically successful way.

There is a commonplace tendency among reviewers to compare Pamuk's novels in translation to other novels, translated and originals, and his style to other world authors' styles (whom reviewers also read in translation). This tendency results in erroneous reviews and leaves unacknowledged the mediated nature of the text and the translator as an intermediary. This review, too, supports my argument that reviewers assume that translation is a transparent medium. Uniformly, reviewers avoid discussing the text as a translation and the translator as its interpreter and rewriter.

Praise for stylistic accomplishment goes to the original writer, and when something in the text bothers the reviewers, they blame the translator. When reviewers have difficulty understanding the narrative, their anxiety at not being able to read the original text is revealed in ambiguous descriptions of the novel or in ambivalent reviews. Ambivalent reviews often praise the language but find problems with the plotline and the story. However, when the plotline is weak in the original, the translator cannot amend that. A conscientious translator can only leave her idiosyncratic signature on the stylistic aspects of the translation.

Patrick Parrinder, writing for *London Review of Books*, is another reviewer who highly praises *The Black Book*. In particular, he commends the style of the text and comments positively on intertextual and metatextual references. He lauds Pamuk's accomplishment of blending harmoniously two different styles, literary and journalistic. Parrinder discusses the quotes and epigraphs in the text and, based on them, he identifies some of Pamuk's European and Middle Eastern literary influences. In both *Kara Kitap* and *The Black Book*, each chapter is preceded by an epigraph from literary texts such as *Madame Bovary*, *Inferno*, *Remembrance of Things Past*, and *The Conference of the Birds*. Parrinder's discussion of intertextuality leads to another significant issue regarding translations. Translators have to quote other translations when they

render epigraphs or quotes from world literature in English translation. For instance, Güneli Gün quotes from Alan Russell's English translation of *Madame Bovary*, from Mark Musa's translation of *Dante's Inferno*, from C. K. Scott-Moncrieff and Terence Kilmartin's translation of *Remembrance of Things Past*, and from Afkham Darbandi and Dick Davis's translation of *The Conference of the Birds*. In the new translation of *The Black Book*, Maureen Freely quotes from the same sources due to copyright restrictions.²⁹ Intertextuality in translation and the translators' preference to quote one translation rather than another or rather than providing their own translations carries significance. In order to recreate the allusion to that text and an echo of that quote, the translator has to make use of the vocabulary and stylistic elements of that quote throughout the translation. This is how translators recreate allusions that occur in the original. This requires the translator's active engagement with the quoted texts as well as with the original. Reviewers like Parrinder commend Pamuk for his literary allusions but leave the translator unacknowledged. Parrinder draws similarities between Pamuk, Borges, Calvino, Eco, and Pynchon, leaving unacknowledged numerous other translators in between.

Among the English reviewers, Parrinder is one of few to be able to identify references to non-European literature in *The Black Book*. He finds similarities between the character Jelal and Mevlana Jelalleddin Rumi. In a brief remark, he comments, "The wealth of allusions to Sufism and related Arabic and Persian traditions will regrettably be lost on most western readers—what they will find instead are tantalizing glimpses of one of the richest of the archaic cultural sources of modern civilization" (1995 n. p.). I argue that it is the translation that recreates the wealth of allusions to Sufism and Arabic and Persian literatures, which Parrinder calls "the archaic cultural sources of modern civilization." Parrinder does not read the original text. How would he know that the original alludes to these sources? He assumes that he reads the original or that the

²⁹ I learned this from my personal correspondence with her.

translation is a transparent copy of the original. Similarly, Robert Irwin comments on the similarities between *The Black Book* and works by al-Attar, Şeyh Galip, and Rumi, which he calls “*The Black Book*’s oriental sources” (7 July 1995 21). Irwin refers to Rumi’s monumental work of Sufi literature as “a rambling compilation of fables, stories, and mystical meditations cast in verse.” Not only is the western reviewer’s assumption of superiority implicit in these statements but also the assumption that the translation is a transparent medium. The translator as an intermediary and the re-creator of these allusions is left out.

In subsequent chapters, I focus on Güneli Gün’s, Maureen Freely’s, and Ingrid Iren’s translations of Pamuk’s *Kara Kitap* to challenge the assumption of invisibility. My analyses call attention to the translators’ craft and urge book reviewers to review translations with respect and sensitivity to the translator’s work. I will start with Pamuk and his *Kara Kitap*.

Orhan Pamuk and *Kara Kitap*

Pamuk occupies a precarious position on the world literary and cultural map. In Turkey, he is glorified by some as a cultural hero and bitterly attacked by others for not being sufficiently loyal to his nation. Abroad, he is idealized as a cosmopolitan writer who transcends his home country and is often mistakenly taken as a representative of all literary production in Turkish. The awarding of the Nobel Prize for literature in 2006 to Pamuk was historically significant for a number of reasons. First, it was the first Nobel Prize to honor a Turkish writer and only the second to be granted to an author from a Muslim country. It attested to Pamuk’s strong, unique, and, on the whole, laudable oeuvre. The Swedish academy’s announcement cited Pamuk as a writer who found symbols to express the clash and interlacing of cultures through the quest of

the melancholic soul of his native city.³⁰ Second, the award could be seen as an indirect vote of the Nobel committee in favor of Turkey's accession to the European Union. By championing the cultural situation of Turkey, which has long been portrayed as poor, heavily populous, and Muslim, all justifications for Turkey's exclusion from Europe, the Nobel committee challenged age-old stereotypes about this country. Furthermore, the award has encouraged a reevaluation of Turkey's literary past and present as evident in the growth of national and international critical interest and assessment. The prize has positively contributed to the growing interest and appreciation of Turkish literature in comparative literary analysis.

Pamuk and the Novel in Turkish

The novel as a genre was introduced to the Turkish literary scene in the late nineteenth century. The immediate reaction to the importation of this genre was to adapt this new form to suit social and cultural values. Following the founding of the Turkish Republic in the 1923, the novel became the major literary vehicle for articulating and consolidating the idea of the nation. The literary scholar Jale Parla has identified a recurring thematic pattern across Turkish novelistic tradition from its emergence in 1870s until present day. This pattern consists of the themes of house, the father, history as memory and identity, writing, and the writer (*Don Kişot'tan Bugüne Roman* 2001). During and after the Republican Era, the same themes continued to preoccupy writers as a means to interrogate fundamental questions of cultural and national belonging. That is, the novel was considered a medium for political and social historiography. It was used as an educational tool for social reforms.

In the 1980s, a paradigm shift took place. Writers began to regard the novel as a form with artistic value of its own, where language, style, and narrative techniques played a role no

³⁰ <http://nobelprize.org/mediaplayer/index.php?id=33>

less important than the content. The military coup of 1980 was the beginning of “depoliticisation” in the country (Göknar “The Novel in Turkish” 498). In literature, this led to a shift away from social issues and realism to questioning the grand narratives of nationalism, Kemalism, and socialism. Novelists turned away from their earlier projects of acculturation. Globalization has become the dominant trend in literature. Although western reception of post-1980s Turkish literature characterizes this body of works as “postmodern,” their manifestations in the Turkish context need to be seen as expressions of post-Kemalist post-socialism and neo-Ottomanism. The same themes identified by Parla and mentioned above continue to preoccupy the Turkish novelists. Nevertheless, beginning the 1980s, writers have foregrounded predominantly the themes of history as memory and identity, writing, and the writer. Pamuk’s work has been most influential in the consolidation of this turn. I see *Kara Kitap* as one major novel representing the shift away from utilitarianism to literary and aesthetic experimentation.

Pamuk emerged on the Turkish literary scene as well-read and fully aware of the Turkish and world literary traditions. As he has often admitted, he read extensively across various literary traditions, and in the background of each of his novels is extensive literary and historical research coupled with creativity (*Other Colors* 113). Taking on the novelistic heritage at home, Pamuk preoccupied himself with the same themes mentioned above. At the same time, his novels brought about the thematic transformation from a local to a global idiom.

In his eight novels and other writings, Pamuk advocates understanding between seemingly contradictory or opposing cultural logics. Each of his novels contains representations of unstable identity, doubles, and copies caught in a specific Ottoman or Turkish historical context. His oeuvre is a catalogue of genres, stretching from the realist *Cevdet Bey ve Oğulları* (1982; *Cevdet Bey and Sons*) to the modernist *Sessiz Ev* (1983; *Silent House* or *Quiet House*);

from the postmodernist allegory of *Beyaz Kale* (1985; *The White Castle*) to the “Eastern” and “Western” intertext of *Kara Kitap* (1990; *The Black Book* [1995 and 2006]); from the Sufi metafiction of *Yeni Hayat* (1994; *The New Life* [1997]) to the historiographic postmodernism of *Benim Adım Kırmızı* (1998; *My Name Is Red* [2001]) to his most political novel *Kar* (2002; *Snow* [2004]), from the beguilingly evocative descriptions of his home city, *İstanbul: Hatıralar ve Şehir* (2003; *İstanbul: Memories and the City* [2004]) to the epic chronicle of unrequited love in *Masumiyet Müzesi* (2008; *The Museum of Innocence* [2009]).

In general, Pamuk's work represents a fictionalized yet veritable chronicle of Turkish life and culture caught in conflict between Europe and the Middle East and in transition from tradition to modernity. His novels present a variety of narrative techniques and designs, and reveal the measured development of the author's style and tone over thirty years. His work depicts characters, like the author himself, trapped simultaneously in exoticist and nationalist discourses, and going through self-assessment. Such interrogation allows the author to manifest alternative mediums of expression and other sites of identification. These attempts often fail within the confines of the plot itself but are redeemed by the author's intervention and comment at the end of each novel. As Erdağ Göknar has pointed out, Pamuk's every novel “is doubled,” that is, a story of failure is juxtaposed with a narrative of hybrid or multi-perspectival authority (“The Novel in Turkish” 503). Going beyond nationalist themes of his literary fathers, Pamuk reveals how “self” and “other” are dependent, symbiotic, and even fluid. His fiction questions the notion of a national identity based on single ethnicity, religion, or culture. Aesthetics and politics are implicitly conjoined in his narrative, aimed at reflecting transformation and change in Turkish identity.

The Turkish Language and Pamuk's Language in *Kara Kitap*

The Turkish language belongs to the Turkic group of the Altaic branch of the general Uralo-Altaic family. Contrary to some misconceptions, Turkish is not related to Arabic or Farsi. Yet Turkish has absorbed a large number of words from these two languages as a consequence of its interaction with them in the context of Islam. Morphologically, a great number of suffixes are used in a given order to express the majority of grammatical ideas such as person, number, tense, aspect, possession, etc. Stylistically, rules governing Turkish word order are much less rigid compared to English. Words have a great freedom to occur in different positions in a sentence, usually causing only stylistic differences or difference in emphasis. Single-word sentence structures with extensive suffixation are common. Sentences with a relatively small number of phrases, of which the possessive construction is the most important, correspond to various types of English clauses. Phonologically, the phonetic shape of a vowel is determined by the vowel that occurs in the immediately preceding syllable of a multisyllabic word. This regular alternation is often referred to as vowel harmony, which nonnative speakers of the language often identify as the “music in the language.” On the content side, Turkish is tradition-bound. The mention of a single word referring to a cliché, a proverb, or an anecdote, of which there are thousands, often suffices to activate complex meanings stored in the mind of every Turkish speaker. This brief description of the Turkish language serves to explain how Pamuk makes use of it.

In *Kara Kitap*, Pamuk writes in a casual yet culturally resonant idiom that is colloquial and often humorous although he often switches to lofty languages and formal decorousness. He valorizes language and style to engage with historical and identity issues of modern-day Turkey. Through his use of colloquial idiom, he reveals the subtle values of the culture from which he

comes. This is the language of the insider. It is encoded, and it is the hardest part of the language to learn and translate. *Kara Kitap*'s politically and ideologically charged language is a "heteroglossia" of voices and internal dialogues with myriad historical and cultural facts (Bakhtin 263).

In *Kara Kitap*, Pamuk frequently departs from the usual subject-object-verb order of ordinary syntax. He uses the flexibility of the Turkish syntax, which I described above, to the utmost by crafting modifiers loaded with extensive details and simulating spoken and everyday language. In some of his notoriously long sentences, which I quoted in the first part of this chapter, the reader often loses track of what noun stands for the subject and which word for the verb. This is not necessarily wrong or incorrect, contrary to what some language purists would argue. Carefully thought out and crafted by Pamuk, this aspect of the text has an effect on the reading experience and on the interpretation of the novel. Any interpretation of the novel that does not consider the interwoven nature of language and meaning in this text is bound to fail. Content and form, signification and the sign are embedded in each other. Search, in general, and search for identity, in specific, are not treated only thematically but also reflected stylistically in the language and in the structure of the novel as a constant rewriting of stories and histories. This is significant for understanding the translations. Translating into another language necessarily means separating the content and the language since a new and different language interferes and brings into the text its own signification. Translating this novel into another language would not mean finding an equivalent of every word but finding the most appropriate form in the target language to contain the meaning.

Reception in Turkish

Pamuk tells us that the original idea for *Kara Kitap* came to him in the late seventies. He aimed to evoke the life on the streets of Istanbul, where the writer lived as a child, and to depict the confused state of the city, of its past and present. In a journal that Pamuk began to keep in 1979, he wrote about the intended protagonist of *Kara Kitap*: a thirty-five-year-old intellectual, who runs away from home and whose experience over a weekend eventually culminates in a national catastrophe and citywide power outage. The story had the atmosphere of Brueghel and Bosch's paintings, of the *Masnavi*, of the *Shahnameh*, and of *A Thousand and One Nights* (*Other Colors* 255).

When these thoughts were taking shape in the writer's mind, he had not yet published his first novel, *Cevdet Bey ve Oğulları* (1982; *Cevdet Bey and Sons*). It occurred to him that he could subsequently write a novel with the title *The Shattered Miniature* (255). It seems that the author took more pleasure in constructing *Kara Kitap*'s backbone than he did in the novels he was writing at that time, *Sessiz Ev* (*The Silent House* or *Quiet House*) and *Beyaz Kale* (*The White Castle*). Pamuk tells us that he was "at pains to replicate Nişantaşı," the neighborhood in Istanbul where he grew up, and thus paid attention to the streets, avenues, and their atmosphere (256). We learn that Alaaddin, one of the characters in the novel, is a real person who has a real store next to the police station in Nişantaşı. Many readers in Turkey already know this from the interviews Alaaddin went on to give after the publication of the novel. These details are significant for the readers of the Turkish text. They do not have similar impact on the readers of the translations in English and German, thus the difference in reception, a point I am going to elaborate in more detail below.

One of the most challenging novels of twentieth-century Turkish literature, *Kara Kitap*'s reception in Turkish is as puzzling as the world the novel itself describes. *Kara Kitap* has created discussions among senior scholars of Turkish literature and lay readers alike. As Walter Andrews points out, there has never been “a Turkish novel so much written about in such a short time” (“The Black Book and Black Boxes” 106). It has generated much literature about itself, both national and international. Some readers talk about the pleasures of reading the novel while others harshly criticized it. Exemplary of the polemical discussions that took place in Turkey on the novel is Fethi Naci. One of the most prominent Turkish writers and literary critics, Naci declared that he had written his article “Dizeyi Anımsıyor musunuz?” (“Do you remember the line?” referring to Pamuk’s notoriously long sentences in *Kara Kitap*) before he even finished reading the novel (25).

The literary establishment in Turkey often dwelled on the linguistic aspects of *Kara Kitap*. More liberal readership found Pamuk’s language to be innovative while others criticized and dismissed the novel based on how Pamuk experimented with language. The Norwegian linguist Brent Brendemoen defended Pamuk’s stylistic innovations. He characterized Pamuk’s language as an attempt to apply the rhetorical principles of spoken language on long syntactic structures (“konuşma dilinin söylem ilkelerinin uzun söz dizimi yapıları içine nasıl yedirileceğidir”; “Orhan Pamuk-Bir Türkçe Sözdizimi Yenilikçisi” 129). Brendemoen points out that the long and complex sentences are much more frequent in the first half of the novel and they occur in chapters narrating Galip’s search for Rüya. This, I see as Pamuk’s attempt to model the syntax of the text after Galip’s sad feelings about the long, tedious, and unfruitful search for his wife in the backstreets of Istanbul. Simultaneously, Galip’s labyrinthine journey calls for long and meandering sentences, which the syntax of the Turkish language allows and which

Pamuk exploits in this novel. At times these sentences are a paragraph long while paragraphs often take as long as a page. This aspect of the novel alienated other readers such as the Turkish literary critic Tahsin Yücel, who belongs to a group of language purists with no patience for linguistic innovation. Yücel described Pamuk's language as "wild and wrong usage" (Yücel 49). Yücel's comment is limited when considered in the light of Celal's newspaper columns, which are written in short, abrupt, and succinct sentences. In these columns, Pamuk masterfully simulates the journalistic style as practiced in Turkey. These two readers' take on the novel is characteristic of the polar reception of *Kara Kitap* in Turkey.

Two edited volumes published in Turkish, *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar* (1996; *Essays on The Black Book*) and *Orhan Pamuk'u Anlamak* (1991; *Understanding Orhan Pamuk*, collected the immediate responses to the novel. These responses include scholarly articles as well as essays and polemical pieces published in popular literary magazines and newspapers. The reception of *Kara Kitap* in Turkish is extremely diverse and polemical. From the basic questions related to the text's genre, to its questioning of the end of realism, its metafictional aspects, and its relationship with modernist and postmodernist literary trends, *Kara Kitap* has generated various discussions. Some see the novel as a metaphor for the changing face of the city of Istanbul;³¹ others focus on more philosophical issues such as the relationship between language and meaning.³² Some see *Kara Kitap* as a theory of the postmodern novel (Koçak, Moran), an encyclopedic novel (Adak), a quest in the tradition of mystical Islam (Kim), and an extended mediation on identity (Bayrav, Yavuz, Koçak). Some read the novel in order to follow the literary traditions it has addressed (Şimşek), others discuss its metafictional aspects (Moran "Üstkurmaca Olarak *Kara Kitap*") or focus on the theme of the original versus its copy (Parla

³¹ Cf. essays by Belge, Irzık, Adak in *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar* (1996).

³² Cf. essays by Naci, Akatlı, Atakay, Yücel, Baykam, Şener in *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar* (1996).

“*Kara Kitap* Neden Kara?”). There are even some readers who measure the success of the novel based on its attention to correct Turkish grammar and syntax (Naci). Most recently, Azade Seyhan read it as a bildungsroman, as “a quest ... about rebuilding or a new *Bildung*” (*Tales of Crossed Destinies* 150).

Kara Kitap’s formal and structural aspects have puzzled readers as well. It has been read as a mirror that reflects all the major genres while fitting into none of them (Koçak). It has been compared to medieval romances, *The Canterbury Tales*, *Decameron*, *A Thousand and One Nights*, to the picaresque tradition, and to didactic, lyrical, and detective fiction (Moran “Üstkurmaca Olarak *Kara Kitap*”). While some see it as a modern novel based on Middle Eastern literary traditions (Kim), others read it as an echo of popular oral traditions (Brendemoen “Orhan Pamuk and his *Black Book*”).

Kara Kitap

Kara Kitap is Pamuk's fourth novel, and in it he makes the thematic tropes of history as memory and identity, writing, and the writer converge in the central motive of the search, the archetype of world literature. This is how Pamuk invests in his native thematic tradition while at the same time transforming it from a local into a global novelistic idiom.

The plot of the novel is simple, yet the way it is presented is complex. The novel narrates Galip’s gloomy search for his runaway wife, Rüya, on the backstreets of Istanbul. He is a thirty-three-year-old attorney and a devoted reader of his fifty-five-year-old cousin, the famous newspaper columnist Celal Salik. Rüya is also Celal’s half-sister. Galip returns home one evening to find out that Rüya has left him. He searches for clues to figure out where she might be, telephones her friends, and suspects that she has gone back to her ex-husband. When Galip

manages to locate the ex-husband, he finds out that the ex-husband has remarried and has not seen Rüya for years. Galip discovers that Celal has also been missing for days and guesses that Celal and Rüya may be hiding somewhere together. Galip reads Celal's columns in order to reach some clues as to where Celal and Rüya might be hiding. Galip has a love/hate relationship to Celal. He likes him and reads him every day and yet fears him. He wants to get close to him and yet to run away from him. He searches for him and yet wants to put him out of his mind and life.

In the first part of the novel, Galip reads Celal's columns daily, follows what he takes to be clues, and roams the backstreets of Istanbul. The first part of the novel depicts his literal journey to various Istanbul addresses. After searching in vain for a while, it occurs to Galip that Celal might have moved to the attic in the family building, known as "Şehrikalp Apartmanı" (Heart of the City Apartment building) where he once used to live. Galip goes there and manages to get into the apartment, which is how the first part of the novel comes to an end, with Galip at the threshold of Celal's apartment.

In Celal's apartment, Galip receives phone calls that mistake him for Celal. Galip responds to them as if he were Celal. Galip begins reading Celal's old columns in order to acquire his "memory banks." He finds out that Celal has written about Jalāl ad-Dīn Rūmī and realizes that his own experience of the past five days is very similar to what happens to Rumi as he searches for Shams, his "soul mate," whom Rumi's jealous disciples have murdered and thrown down a well. Rumi's search is an allegory of the stages that a Sufi disciple must pass through in order to attain the goal of knowledge and union with God (Schimmel 314). A similar interpretation applies to Galip whose search entails more than finding Celal and Rüya. In Celal's apartment, Galip sits at Celal's desk and types columns, which he delivers to the newspaper. He

keeps on receiving phone calls from women and threats from men, who take him to be Celal and hold him responsible for past affairs and columns published in the newspaper. Galip calls Iskender, a friend of his who is escorting a group of BBC reporters around Istanbul, and promises to get Celal to do an interview with the reporters. Galip leaves the apartment to look for a man and his wife, whom he has promised to meet in front of Alaaddin's store. They do not show up. When Galip gets to the Pera Palas Hotel, he tells Iskender that Celal asked him to do the interview in his place and that he should just tell the journalists that he is Celal. When Galip finally gets home, he sees Celal lying dead in front of Alaaddin's store. He returns to Celal's apartment and goes to bed. The next morning the doorman's wife comes to the door and tells him that Rüya's dead body has been found in Alaaddin's store.

In September there is a military coup. One of the many theories held by the police regarding Celal's death is that he had arranged for someone to kill him. Later, the police arrest a barber whom Celal had mentioned in one of his columns. The barber had visited Celal and asked him questions about the destiny of the East. Celal responded with a joke and wrote a satirical column about the whole issue in the paper, offending the barber. When the column was reprinted twenty-two years later, during Celal's absence, the barber supposedly decided to avenge himself and murdered Celal. The barber is hanged for the murder. Galip cannot solve the mystery of the murder of Celal and his wife, but he appears to have solved the mystery of life. At the end of the novel, Galip comments that the only way to be oneself is to become someone else or to lose oneself in somebody's story. The novel's last words are Galip's comment that there is nothing more astounding than life, except for writing, which he considers to be the ultimate consolation.

The plot takes place in Istanbul during ten days in January 1980. More precisely, Pamuk sets his story in a time frame, beginning on Thursday, January 10, and going through Saturday,

January 19, of that year, although the final chapter contains an epilogue that takes the reader through the military coup of September 12, 1980, and its immediate aftermath. The novel is written in a way similar to the genre of detective fiction. Part one of the novel consists of nineteen chapters and part two of seventeen. The novel has a bilateral structure in that it consists of two parts and each chapter of narration alternates with a corresponding newspaper column. Chapters narrating Galip's journey are written in third-person omniscient narrator, who often switches to Galip's point of view and at the end of the novel becomes the author, Pamuk. The newspaper columns are narrated in journalistic style, written and narrated by Celal, a first-person narrator. As the book progresses, the two styles become alike. In the beginning, the novelistic (fictional) and the journalistic (factual) styles are clearly separated by alternating chapters, their stylistic peculiarities, and by their corresponding narrators. This clear-cut distinction between styles, chapters, fact, fiction, voices, narrators, and characters dissolves as the story progresses, disappears entirely, and merges in the voice of the actual author at the end of the novel. The merging of the seemingly distinct dimensions of the novel begins in the second part, where Galip assumes Celal's voice and identity by moving into his flat, appropriating his clothes, responding to the phone calls in his name, and by literally writing columns and sending them to the newspaper for publication. Celal's disappearance (and eventual murder) gives Galip the opportunity to discover various facets of his own self, in which writing and becoming a writer are central.

Kara Kitap is an allegory of the modern man's search for self, identity, and understanding, through the subthemes of being oneself versus being somebody else (on the individual level) and originality versus imitation (on the collective level in the context of Turkish modernity). Since the novel is self-referential, it could be interpreted as being about the pleasures

of reading and writing and a warning against the danger of confusing literature with life. The last sentences of the novel “Çünkü hiçbir şey hayat kadar şaşırtıcı olamaz. Yazı hariç. Yazı hariç. Evet tabii, tek teselli yazı hariç” (“After all nothing could be as surprising as life. Except for writing. Except for writing. Yes, of course, except for writing, the sole consolation”) extols writing and the profession of the writer at the expense of the pleasures of life (Pamuk *Kara Kitap* 442).

One possible interpretation of the novel, among many, is that Galip (the victorious) searches for Rüya (his dream or ideal ego), wins over Celal (the angry god or the father figure) by killing him and assuming his identity and, in the process, killing the dream as well. The novel is a mystery without a solution. At the end of the novel, there are several suspects as to who might have killed Celal and Rüya but their murder is never actually resolved. Galip once tells Rüya, who is addicted to crime fiction, that the only detective fiction worth reading would be the one in which the author didn’t know the identity of the murderer, in a way giving away the novel’s ending and suggesting (im)possible/(un)limited interpretations (Pamuk, *Kara Kitap* 55).

Pamuk has intricately integrated the theme of search for identity on the formal and structural levels. At the level of the plot, the theme of search for identity is revealed in Celal’s search for Rüya and Galip. At the level of narration, this theme is revealed through the narrative instability inscribed by the two writers, Celal and eventually Galip. Galip identifies with Celal, masquerades as Galip, and eventually becomes Galip. The shift in identities is further destabilized by the frequent shifts of the narrative voice and by the actual writer’s commentary on the act of writing at the end.

The central motif of the novel is the search, a multilayered and circular quest. On the literal level it is a detective story of a man searching for clues in the city to find out where his

wife and his older cousin/her half-brother might be hiding. The literal search allows the writer to reveal fictional snapshots of his native city. This motif allows him to comment on “Şehrin İşaretleri” (“The Signs of the City,” a chapter in the novel) such as the overcrowded apartment buildings, stuffed busses, offices, stores, underground warehouses, historical monuments, and the Bosphorus, turning the city into an “encyclopedia site” of “compact memory archives” (Seyhan 150–51). Galip’s search is interrupted by fantastic stories, visions, and intertextual inserts. At one point, he goes through the stages of a Dantean descent to the underworld and ascent to the top of a mosque.

This literal search is complicated by an alternative quest for psychological, personal, communal, and historical origins. When the literal search proves unfruitful, Galip embarks on a more intellectual search. Galip’s transformation takes place at Celal’s apartment, where his reading intensifies and his writing begins. The second journey culminates when Celal is murdered and Galip fully assumes Celal’s personality. In addition, it is possible to read the history of modernity in Turkey through this second search, impersonated in Galip. We read that Rüya and Galip are murdered but we never find out by whom and how. This journey does not have a closure, neither is it about facts or solutions. It is an allegory of “a Turkish intelligentsia in search of an identity in a cultural vacuum” impersonated in Galip (Seyhan 152). In Pamuk’s text and in the motif of search, the private and public histories and stories are interconnected. Any conscientious reading of the novel has to reflect on the “collapse of the private and public” in this text (Tükkân 2008 94).

Thus, plot (a man searching for his runaway wife), themes (individual and communal identity in the making), and style (baroque and flamboyant mixture of casual and culturally resonant idiom, colloquial expressions, journalistic style of lofty language and formal

decorousness, new Turkish words, mixing of old Turkish and Arabic expressions, experimenting with official language and syntax) converge in the motif of a search and create this polyphonic, polyvalent, and unreliable narrative.

Structurally, *Kara Kitap* consists of lots of independent stories, some of them linked to each other by themes, some by characters, and some by locations, and all set within the frame story of Galip's search. The journey motif is a means to reveal snapshots of the city, its inhabitants, and its cultural, historical, and social flavors. Scholars and critics have discovered structural and thematic affinities between *Kara Kitap* and the masterworks of the Middle East, such as Rumi's *The Masnavi* (1273), Şeyh Galip's *Beauty and Love* (2005; *Hüsn- ü Aşk* [1782]), Attar's *Conference of the Birds* (*Mantık al-tayr* [1177]), and *A Thousand and One Nights* (Kim 1993; Moran 1994; Brendemoen 2009). *Kara Kitap* abounds in references to these works, either in the form of epigraphs at the beginning of each chapter or more subtly through the names of the characters and through structural and thematic associations. However, the relationships between *Kara Kitap* and these works are not straightforward. Pamuk's innovation and ingenuity is revealed in the ways he combines, juxtaposes, and superimposes these influences, structurally and thematically, without placing himself in debt or dominion.

Rumi's *The Masnavi* is the most essential literary work for understanding Sufi mysticism. In it, Rumi tells various stories, all of which share the common theme of reaching for a divine understanding through earthly love and not through reason. However, these stories are not connected by a frame story of a search, the way *Kara Kitap* is structured. Şeyh Galip's *Hüsn ü Aşk* (*Beauty and Love*), an allegorical work, narrates Aşk's journey to find the magic potion in order to get permission to marry Hüsn (Beauty). Eventually, Aşk realizes that Hüsn is inside him and not independent from him. Throughout his journey, Aşk undergoes various trials and

tribulations, all interconnected and culminating at the end in his epiphany. Similarly, Attar's *Conference of the Birds* (*Mantık al-tayr* [1177]), another allegorical work, relates the journey of the birds to find Simurg. Along the way, the birds encounter difficulties that make for the various stories at the heart of the work. These stories are all interrelated and eventually culminate in the Sufi mystical understanding of finding the divine inside the self. Although *A Thousand and One Nights* has a frame story similar to that of *Kara Kitap*, there is no literal journey involved in it. The rest of the stories in *A Thousand and One Nights* are not related to the frame story per se, the way Galip's search is motivated or directed by the stories he hears, reads, or writes about in the course of his ten-day journey. The patterns of journey and storytelling central to these works reiterate in *Kara Kitap* yet they are used and/or combined differently. *Kara Kitap* consists of a frame story and various other stories. Some of these stories are directly related to Galip's search, some are not, and some constitute clues or red herrings for the reader. That is, Pamuk has been inspired by canonical works of Persian, Arabic, and other Middle Eastern literary traditions and by Sufi mysticism, but he combines their structural and thematic aspects in a unique way to compose his masterwork, to transcend their local aspects, and to depict the mysteries of Istanbul.

Character names and their meanings are significant for an adequate reading of *Kara Kitap* and its translations. The names reveal the double plane of illusion and reality that is the major concern of the novel. The author connects every other literary element, an allusion, a pun, even a color, to these two planes that work collaterally in Galip's story.

Galip, which means "victor" or "victorious," is the main protagonist. He comes across as the wronged and naïve husband who has turned blind eye to the mutual frustration of his marriage in fear of losing his wife. He is the contemporary man, neurotic, impotent, self-conscious, clumsy, envious, infatuated, masochistic, and narcissistic. As he searches for Rüya, he

grows bolder as expressed in his one-night sexual affair with a prostitute. Rüya for him is everything: a wife, beloved, mistress, seducer, sister, friend, confidante, dream, and reality at once. He misconceives her as representing absolute beauty and often in the novel she is referred to as the “beautiful Rüya.” Therefore, her loss is the loss of everything for him.

Galip’s search for Rüya parallels his investigation about himself and life in general. Galip is named after Şeyh Galip, the eighteenth-century mystic poet of the well-known poem *Hüsn-ü Aşk*. Pamuk makes his literary allusions clear by quoting various works in epigraphs to chapters in the novel. For instance, the epigraph “‘Esrarı Mesnevi’den aldım’ Şeyh Galip” (“I took the secret/mystery/enigma/drug from the *Masnevi*’ Şeyh Galip”) precedes chapter 14 of part 2 and refers to Şeyh Galip’s comment on how he was inspired by Mevlana’s *Masnevi* (Pamuk, *Kara Kitap* 381). Similarly, *Kara Kitap*’s Galip is inspired by and follows his “guide” and literary father, Celal. Şeyh Galip provides the novel with its mystical underpinnings and with references to his mystical romance *Hüsn-ü Aşk*. With this quote, Pamuk explicitly indicates the connection between the two stories. Earlier in the novel, the reader learns that Galip falls in love with Rüya after he reads *Hüsn-ü Aşk*, a more subtle reference to Şeyh Galip’s masterpiece. Initially, Galip’s quest for his lost wife is a platonic search, just like that of Love (Aşk)’s for Beauty (Hüsn). As Galip completes his urban tours, he disintegrates. Eventually, when Rüya and Celal are found dead at the end of the novel, Galip reaches a reintegration and a (problematic) union with himself.

Rüya means “dream” and represents the intangible ideal in the novel. She is the muse, the inspiration, the inciter, and the pseudo-enchantress of Galip’s search. Except for the opening chapter, where she is asleep, and for an almost surreal short telephone conversation between her and Galip a couple of chapters later, she is physically absent from the text. She is a mere

nostalgic recollection of Galip's. The question of whether she belongs to the world of fact or that of illusion remains unclear throughout the novel. Yet, and contrary to book reviewers' expectations, her "absence" fulfills a function in the overall interpretation of the novel. When *Kara Kitap* is viewed through the lens of Sufi mysticism, Rüya is the necessary "dream," the blue color in the opening paragraph of the novel, which moves in and out of the text to simulate the habitual hue of cinematic dream sequence for Galip. The characterization of Rüya strikingly follows the construction of the female image in mystical romances. She represents only one of the layers of Galip's circular and concentric journey to reach Celal and beyond. When she fulfills her function and becomes incapable of supporting the role that is assigned to her, she dies. Galip's longing for union extends beyond Rüya. It entails Celal and becoming Celal. Unable to grasp this dimension of the text, book reviewers criticized the text as "lacking" in "erotic heat."

Celal Salik is Rüya's step-brother and the famous columnist for the newspaper *Milliyet*. "Celal" means "grand, almighty, mighty, majestic, superior, distinct, dominant" but also "anger, rage, fury, temper, wrath" (or "angry," "furious," "wrathful"). With this name, Pamuk alludes to Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi, the thirteenth-century Persian Sufi poet of the *Masnavi*. On the level of a detective story, *Kara Kitap* is about Galip's search for his wife. This search leads to another one, a personal and spiritual search, where the search for Rüya turns into a quest for Celal, Galip's double and second self. Celal does not have a physical presence in the novel. He is a text that Galip reads every day. Appropriate to the meaning of his name, Celal is at once strong-willed and angry, dashing, derisive, and imposing. He remains an enigmatic persona, surrounded by an almost impenetrable and dark aura. In his columns, Celal presents himself as a savior and a Mehdi figure; at the same time, he often writes about his deteriorating memory. Thus, his writings cannot be trusted entirely: sometimes they are clues for Galip but most often, red

herrings. Celal's deteriorating memory foreshadows his death, both physically and metaphorically. Similar to Rüya, Celal fulfills a function in the novel. He is Galip's guide and the ultimate object of Galip's love. In this sense, the killing of Celal is a literary patricide. It turns the entire story into an allegory of authorial begetting.

Chapter 2: Güneli Gün's *The Black Book* (1994)

Plutarch discovered happiness through a foreign tongue, in his case, the perennial language of the Romans, which revealed itself to him late and after much travail. Strange but true, Plutarch muses: it was not through the knowledge of Latin words that he came to understand things, but through his experience of things that he came to understand Latin words. I too have translated my experience of things into a foreign tongue, in my case English, which I consider very big and so very beautiful.

—Güneli Gün

In this chapter, I focus on Güneli Gün, the first translator of Pamuk's *Kara Kitap*. I explain her translation with reference to Gün's position as a creative writer and translator in the United States. The reception of her translations was the primary reason Orhan Pamuk changed his English translator. Through a close reading of her novels and essays, we discover Gün's thematic preoccupation and stylistic preference as a creative writer and translator. I argue that Gün's translation of *The Black Book* needs to be understood in the context in which it was published. Gün translated the novel at a time when Pamuk did not enjoy international fame. At that time, there was little demand for his novels and Turkish literature. As a result, Gün chose to emphasize *The Black Book*'s allusions to European and American literatures, thereby establishing affinities and closeness between these literatures. In the final analysis, any attempt to evaluate her translation of *The Black Book* without closely considering the context in which she translated the novel and her position as a Turkish-American writer would be incomplete.

Reception of Güneli Gün's Translations in Book Reviews

Discouraged by some British and American reviews of *The Black Book* and *The New Life*, Pamuk changed his English translator to Erdağ Göknar. Pamuk also changed his publisher from Farrar, Straus, and Giroux to Knopf. Since it was mainly the British and American reviews

of *The New Life* that made Pamuk change translators, before I discuss *The Black Book* in Gün's translation, I will discuss reviews of Gün's translation of *The New Life*.

Reviewing *The New Life* for *Times Literary Supplement*, D. M. Thomas writes,

Güneli Gün, who has also rendered the new novel [*The New Life*] into polished, if slightly stilted, English. The cool urbanity of the translation may mask all that cannot be translated. ... Mr. Pamuk's descriptions of violence are powerful; and a long coda—in which an older Osman still seeks Janan ...—is gravely eloquent. But the characters do not breathe, the narrative does not grip and there is not enough of the often banal grain of reality. ... Perhaps Mr. Pamuk, like Turkey, doesn't quite translate into the West. What emerges into English is a skillful play of illusions. Yet what is a book without meat?

Incomplete. (“Crash”)

In a manner characteristic to translation reviews, this reviewer addresses the translation very briefly and with suspicion. Thomas describes the language of the translation as “polished, if slightly stilted.” That is, the language is lofty and formal. Its “cool urbanity ... may mask” a world that is “untranslatable” and inaccessible to the gaze of the new reader. The reviewer's anxiety about not being able to read the original text leads him to attribute what he characterizes as the negative aspects of the text to the translator and other aspects of the text to the author. According to Thomas, “the characters do not breathe, the narrative does not grip,” and representations lack realism. However, the reviewer fails to realize that when the narrative of the original is loose, the translator cannot amend that. The original author is praised while the translator is blamed for the text's shortcomings.

Another British reviewer, Adam Mars-Jones, directly attacks the translation, writing, “*The New Life* is hardly a pleasure to read, and here the blame seems to lie squarely with the

translator, Güneli Gün. Her familiarity with Turkish is not in question, it's her familiarity with English that seems so debatable" (*The Observer*). Nevertheless, he quotes from the text and writes that it is a "book of considerable charm and lyrical force" and that "the translator's ineptness can't take all the freshness out of a passage like this one where Orhan Pamuk briefly drops the mask of the narrator" (*The Observer*). Among the British reviewers, Ronald Wright seems to have heard the echoes that the translator tried to recreate in her translation when he asks "Can it be the Bible? The Koran? The tales of Amadis? Alice in Wonderland? The Origin of Species? The Communist Manifesto? ... Orwell's Room 101 has been invoked, as have the brave new worlds of Shakespeare and Huxley, Rilke's interest in time and essence, the Sufi mysticism of Ibn Ali, amid countless other allusions" (*TLS* October 10, 1997). And yet, he too, expresses his doubts about the translation: "I also suspect the grace-notes have suffered in translation. Pamuk is known as a stylist, but the slangy AmerEnglish offered here does not suit the Turkish setting" (*TLS* October 10, 1997).³³ Wright, who does not read the Turkish text, praises the author for his stylistic skills while the translator is criticized for her decision to opt for an American accent in her translation. This critique is based on the reviewer's judgment that the narrator in a Turkish novel should not and cannot speak American English. Would Wright endorse the translation if it were in formal British English? Certainly, Wright's expectation is fostered by and comes from a long legacy of misrepresentations of Turkish people, their language, and culture in European literature (Shakespeare called them "circumcised dogs"), travel writing (Lady Mary Montague raved about the "freedom" of Turkish women), and cinema (Tony Curtis's *The Thieves of Baghdad*), where Turks are reduced to flat characters, stereotypes, stage Turks, and simply "Muslims" or "Arabs." A closer look at Gün's translation reveals that she employs

³³ The plot of *The New Life* takes place in Turkey of 1970s and 80s, in overcrowded busses driving on Anatolian highways.

idiomatic American language and switches between formal and colloquial expressions when necessary. She makes informed decisions based on a close study of Pamuk's language in this and other novels. Wright attacks her word choice, but it does not occurred to him that Gün might be choosing these words on purpose and taking some informed risks with the language. I will discuss Gün's strategic choices in more detail below.

Since the reviewers above do not read Turkish, they judge the translation based on their expectations of how a Turkish novel in English translation should read. Alev Adil, who reads both Turkish and English, attacks the translation based on what she assumes to be a lack of correspondence between the translation and the original: "Gün is colloquial and pretentious where Pamuk is not. She translates 'sapıyla'—the stem (of a ball pen)—as 'the butt end.' 'Karanlık,' which means 'darkness,' she burdens with the musty lyricism of 'gloaming' ... Gün creates repetition with her limited vocabulary where there is none, and then omits repetitions found in the Turkish text" (*TLS* March 26, 1999). This criticism leaves out considerations such as the intended audience of the translation, which does not correspond to the original's intended audience. Furthermore, Adil's criticism is devoid of contextual considerations. She judges individual word choices in the translation thus: "She [Gün] imbues Pamuk's work with cheap clichés and erases metaphors that would be familiar in translation: a horse that is 'bir deri bir kemik'—skin and bone—becomes simply 'a nag.'" (*TLS* March 26, 1999). Adil's criticism is based on the assumption that Gün's word choice does not correspond to the original's word choice. The solution that Adil proposes above is based on literalism and approximation. However, a translation is more than individual word choice, and the translator's word choice is often governed by other considerations such as sound, style, imagery, or consistency with word choice in the rest of the work.

Reviewing the novel for the British edition of *Financial Times*, Brian Martin finds the novel “philosophical, visionary, hallucinatory. There are strong hints of Bulgakov, a none too convincing denial of Chekhov, and definite echoes from J. G. Ballard's infamous *Crash*” (“Old Habits” n.p.). However, in this positive review, Martin does not once address the fact that he reads a novel in translation or acknowledge the translator. The American writer Tom LeClair reviews *The New Life* for *The Nations* and writes, “The question is: Does Pamuk’s game play in America, in English? ... Gün’s translation initially seemed stilted, nineteenth-century in its diction and syntax. I don’t know Turkish, but since Pamuk refers to Poe in *The Black Book* and since Poe is a central figure in *Lolita*, I’m willing to assume the translation is true to a Romantic-inflected ‘original’” (39). LeClair has read *The Black Book*, which Gün translated before she translated *The New Life*. His reasoning that *The New Life* is “true to a Romantic-inflected ‘original’” is valid. Yet LeClair’s review maintains a questioning tone and a suspicious attitude to the translation while praising the author for what the reviewer find commendable in the text. In his book-length study *Cosmopolitical Claims*, Venkat Mani devotes an entire chapter to *The New Life*, revealing how Pamuk incorporates the German literary texts of Novalis’s *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* and Reiner Maria Rilke’s *Duino Elegies* in order to facilitate a reading that goes beyond national specificity.³⁴ LeClair seems to have “heard” those echoes in the translation even if he does not read the Turkish text, which is an indication of the success and sensitivity of the translator in recreating these “echoes” in a new language. Yet, after comparing the novel to *Lolita*, LeClair concludes that *The New Life* is not “erotic” enough: “*The New Life* is a made-for-Muslims, desexualized *Lolita*” (*The Nation*).

³⁴ Mani provides a rigorous reading of the novel to support his overall argument that Pamuk has “cosmopolitical claims.” Yet, Mani does not discuss the issue of translation and how it might complicate his overall argument. Translations and translators play significant role in Pamuk’s reception abroad and in the formation of “cosmopolitan” discussions regarding this writer.

An anonymous review published in the *Publisher's Weekly* neither mentions the name of the translator nor addresses the issue of translation and yet it reads, "With its fusion of literary elegance and incisive political commentary, Pamuk's previous novel *The Black Book*, drew comparisons to the works of Salman Rushdie and Don DeLillo. Here [in *The New Life*], he confirms that talent, brilliantly chronicling his hapless hero" ("The New Life" 93, 1997). This reviewer praises the novel for its "timeless and moving narrative," commenting that "Pamuk's novel has a headlong intensity, a mesmerizing prose style and the dreamlike quality of a vision" ("The New Life" 93, 1997). Obviously, this reviewer was able to surrender to the pleasures of the text, which is how all writers wish to be read. By writers, I mean, both authors and translators, who do not allow conventional style and diction to neutralize and obliterate their voice. What is disquieting is that this reviewer does not mention the translator's name in connection to the prose but only in the usual credits on top of the column. Katy Emck, who reviews the novel for *New Statesman* writes, "Pellucid, elusive, infinitely suggestive and poignant, it is as though Borges had sustained one of his crystalline fictions for the length of an entire novel" ("Turkish Delight" Oct 31, 1997). Yet she does not mention the name of the translator, not even in the usual credits on top of her column, let alone in connection to the effort of translating Pamuk's demanding prose. As Gün commented once, "If the reviewers actually note that *The New Life* is a translation, they might not like the novel that much" ("Something Wrong with the Language" March 12, 1999).

One of the most insightful assessments of the novel and of the translation comes from the Turkish cultural critic Talat Halman, who hails Gün thus: "a first-rate novelist who writes in English ... has done an impressively successful translation, faithful and idiomatic" ("The Turkish Muse" 233). Compared to the novel, Halman finds the translation better. He writes that

it is hardly Gün's fault that some critics have characterized the text as stilted. About Pamuk's *Yeni Hayat (New Life)*, Halman writes,

Even in terms of postmodernist fantasy, it seems like a mystery wrapped up in a conundrum engulfed in enigma. ... Although the meticulous reader may detect a hidden symmetry, it has no plot or narrative line that can be summarized. No linear arrangement here, only the zigzag of episodic action intermingled with visions that range from nightmarish to epiphanic. (229)

Halman comments that although Pamuk is a superb stylist, occasionally he writes awkward and "careless" sentences, which the translation has managed to expurgate. "*The New Life* corrects them: when one compares the translation against the original, one sees that Gün has fixed them" (234). Halman goes as far as to say that Pamuk should adapt his own novels into English himself thus, "do justice to his fiction by alterations that conscientious translators would be unwilling to introduce" (234).

Negative reviews of *The Black Book* and *The New Life* partly stem from the fact that these novels are not easy to read and comprehend. Talat Halman notes that *The Black Book* has been hailed as Pamuk's "magnum opus" in literary circles and that to call *The New Life* "challenging is euphemism" (229). As a testament to their importance and complexity, after these two novels were published in Turkey, two major scholarly guides appeared on bookshelves: *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar (Writings on Kara Kitap)*, edited by Nükhet Esen and *Orhan Pamuk'u Okumak: Kafası Karışmış Okur ve Modern Roman (Reading Orhan Pamuk: The Confused Reader and the Modern Novel)* written by Yıldız Ecevit. *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar* is a collection of essays and book reviews written in Turkish and other languages, discussing the novel within wide array of themes. In *Orhan Pamuk'u Okumak*, Ecevit provides a stimulating

critical analysis of *The New Life* for “the confused reader,” employing different methodological approaches. *The New Life* is one of Pamuk’s most difficult novels, primarily because of its challenging structure and its elusive themes and characters. These two scholarly additions attest to the novels’ popularity in Turkey, the Turkish reader’s demand to better understand the texts, and by extension the difficult task awaiting their translator.

In his essay on *The New Life*, “Orhan Pamuk at the Heart of Turkish Sadness,” Andrew Mango translated one passage of the novel, which describes how Osman, the protagonist, set out on his first journey. It is instructive to compare his translation with Gün’s version in order to see differences and similarities. Pamuk writes,

Şehrin ağır ağır titreyen iç organlarına; bir felçli gibi kaskatı kesilen betondan caddelerine, süt, et, konserve ve haydut kamyonlarının iniltisiyle sarsılan betondan bulvarlarına girdim. Açık ağızlarındaki pisliği, ışıkları yansıtan ıslak kaldırımlara boşaltan çöp tenekelerini kutsadım; kendi hallerinde hiç duramayan korkunç ağaçlara yol sordum; soluk dükkanlarda kasa başlarında hala hesap yapan vatandaşlara göz kırptım; karakol kapılarında nöbet tutan polislerden sakındım; yeni hayatın ışıltısından habersiz sarhoşlara, evsizlere, dinsizlere ve yurtsuzlara kederle gülümsedim; yanıp sönen kırmızı ışıkların sessizliğinde bana uykusuz günahkarlar gibi usulca sokulan damalı taksilerin söförleriyle kapkaranlık bakiştım; duvarlara asılı sabun reklamlarından bana gülümseyen güzel kadınlara inanmadım; sigara reklamlarındaki yakışıklı erkeklere, Atatürk heykellerine, sarhoşların ve uykusuzların kapıştığı yarının gazetelerine de inanmadım; sabahçı kahvelerinde çay içen milli piyangocuyla bana el edip “otur delikanlı” diye seslenen arkadaşına da. Çürüyen şehrin iç kokuları beni deniz ve köfte, kenef ve egsoz dumanı, benzin ve kir kokan otobüs garajına götürdü. (Pamuk *Yeni Hayat* 46)

Mango renders it as follows:

I entered the city's inner organs, its avenues of concrete, *frozen like the limbs of a paralytic*, its *neon-lit boulevards* shaken by the moan of *lorries carrying* meat, milk, *tinned food* and *bandits*. *I bestowed my blessing* on the dirt piled at the entrance of *open sites*, on the *rubbish cans* overflowing on the wet *pavements* reflecting the light. I asked frightening restless trees to show me the way; I *winked* at citizens still cashing up in *run-down shops*; I shield away from policemen on guard outside police stations; *I smiled sadly at drunks, at people without house or home or religion*, unaware of the radiance of the new life; I exchanged dark glances with the drivers of *chequered taxicabs*, crawling up to me like sleepless sinners in the silence of changing traffic lights; *I refused to believe* the pretty women smiling at me from soap advertisements stuck on walls; nor did I believe the handsome men in cigarette advertisements, the statues of Atatürk, tomorrow's paper fought over by drunks and insomniacs, nor the *national lottery seller* saying "come and sit down young man" and gesturing me to join him in an overnight cafe, nor yet his friend. *The internal smells of the rotting city* drove me to *the coach stations* smelling of sea and meatballs, of *lavatories* and *exhaust fumes*, of *petrol* and dirt. ("Orhan Pamuk," 353; emphasis mine)

Gün's translation:

I proceeded into the inner organs of the city that vibrated steadily, its concrete highways rigid as the arteries of a paralyzed patient, its neon boulevards reverberating with the whine of rowdy trucks carrying meat, milk, and canned food. I consecrated the garbage pails that belched the swill in their maws out on the wet sidewalks that reflected the lights; I asked the gruesome trees that never stand still for directions; I blinked seeing

fellow citizens in dimly lit stores who still sat up at cash registers going over their accounts; I steered clear of the police on duty in front of precinct stations; I smiled forlornly at drunks, vagrants, unbelievers, and outcasts who had no tidings of a glowing new life; I exchanged dark glances with Checker Cab drivers who sneaked up on me like sleepless sinners in the stillness of blinking red lights; I was not deceived by the beautiful women smiling down on me from soap billboards, nor did I put trust in the good-looking men in the cigarette advertisements, nor even in the statues of Atatürk, or the early editions of tomorrow's papers being scrambled up by drunks and insomniacs, or the lottery man drinking tea at an allnight cafe, nor his friend who waved and called out to me, "Take a load off, young man." The innermost stench of the rotting city led me to the bus terminal that reeked of the sea and hamburgers, latrines and exhaust, gasoline and filth. (Pamuk *The New Life* 42–43)

The Turkish text is an example of prose mimicking poetry. The entire paragraph consists of two very long sentences followed by a short one describing the protagonist's impressions as he first enters the city. Pamuk uses poetic language and repetitions, listing one by one Osman's observations. The central metaphor, "şehrin ağır ağır titreyen iç organları" (the inner organs of the city, trembling slowly), compares the city to a living organism and governs the entire paragraph. The simile "felçli gibi" ("like a paralyzed patient") compares the concrete avenues to a paralyzed patient. The second sentence is unusually long and consists of nine dependent clauses connected by the subject "I," Osman, who walks along the avenues and boulevards of the city, observing and engaging with the people he encounters. He is deferential, inquisitive, positive, and smiles at people he encounters; at times scared of the police, and careful and doubtful of the city dwellers he sees late at night (indicated by the darkness) and early in the

morning (indicated by the morning edition of the paper). Pamuk makes an ironic comment when he puts side by side the image of beautiful women on billboards, handsome men on cigarette ads, monuments of Atatürk on the streets, and the morning papers delivered to doorsteps. Osman observes the incongruity of these images as he walks down the streets. Osman's stroll around the city, similar to Galip's journey in *The Black Book*, is another means for Pamuk to give snapshots of his native city and its inhabitants. The passage ends with a relatively shorter sentence that reveals Osman's arrival at his final destination, the bus terminal. In this passage, Pamuk's language is literary and poetic, employing various figures of speech such as metaphors, similes, and juxtapositions to reveal the impressions of his protagonist and to make ironic comments about the history of the city and the nation.

Mango's version is a literal rendition of the passage. Mango opts for generic equivalents in English of Pamuk's diction. In order to render Pamuk's Turkish into a clear English sentence, Mango changes the original's structure and inserting commas, where the original employs semicolons. In Mango's version, sentences end abruptly while in Pamuk's there is a sense of cinematic continuity and listing, one after another, the city-snapshots Osman comes across during his stroll. Mango omits expressions, misreads the original twice, and translates the text into British English. Rendered this way, Mango's translation is clear, reflects almost a scientific precision, and sounds formal.

In the first sentence, Mango omits "ağır ağır titreyen" ("trembling slowly" or "reverberating slowly"). He renders the simile "bir felçli gibi kaskatı kesilen" ("stone-hard like a paralyzed") with "frozen like the limbs of a paralytic." The choice of "limbs" and "paralytic" falls into medical jargon and detracts from the more poetic tone of the original. Mango adds the modifier "neon-lit" while in the Turkish the boulevards are just "concrete" ("betondan

duvarlar”). Mango renders “haydut kamyonları” (outlaw vans) as “lorries carrying ... bandits” although in the original, Pamuk uses the word “outlaw” as an adjective to the “vans,” thereby employing figurative language. “I bestowed my blessing” is a literal translation and yet too wordy to meet the single word of “kutsadım” (“I blessed”). “Open site” is a too-evasive way to solve the problem of “açık ağzlarındaki pisliği,” which refers to the “gazing streets” and their “çöp tenekeleri” (“trash cans”). “Rubbish cans,” “pavements,” “winked,” “chequered,” “taxicabs,” “national lottery seller” “coach station,” “lavatories,” “exhaust fumes,” “petrol,” like the “tinned food” in the sentence before resonate with the British accent. “Soluk dükkanlarda” (“somber stores”) becomes “run-down shops,” which is an inaccurate interpretation. “Soluk” (“pale”) in Turkish is used in association with the human face as in “soluk yüz” to describe a sickly or pale appearance. Pamuk’s choice to associate an adjective used for human beings with the noun “stores” is in line with the entire paragraph, where he personifies everything on the streets to give the impression of the city, heavily populated and alive. Mango fails to capture this in his translation. “Smiled sadly at drunks, at people without house or home or religion” is a literal rendition and yet very wordy compared to the original “evsizlere, dinsizlere ve yurtsuzlara kederle gülümsedim.” The wordiness of Mango’s translation leans towards prose while the original reveals the protagonist’s city stroll in a very poetic language. Mango omits the “red” of the “traffic lights.” “I refused to believe” is literal and awkward, and adds the interpretation of “to believe” to the original “inanmadım,” which is simply “I didn’t trust.” Mango omits that the lottery man is “drinking tea.” In the last dependent clause of the second long sentence, Mango misses that it is the lottery seller’s friend who calls him to sit while Mango interprets it as if it were the lottery seller who speaks: “the national lottery seller saying.” In the last sentence,

“internal smell of the rotting city” is a literal translation yet does not match the poetry of the original “çürüyen şehrin iç kokuları.”

Gün’s version, on the other hand, is extremely faithful to the structure of the original, to its poetic language, sound, and cultural significance. She recreates the colloquial aspects of the original by choosing idiomatic language and colloquial English expressions. One word that disturbs the balance in her translation, leaning too much towards the domestic linguistic and cultural domain, erasing the original’s flavor, is “hamburgers” in the last sentence. Mango finds a better translation: “meatballs.” Compared to Mango’s version, Gün’s translation is more accurate. She opts for synonyms that are more lively, innovative, and allusive. For instance, she goes for “I proceeded” in the first sentence, rather than Mango’s literal “I entered.” While he omits “ağır ağır titreyen” (“reverberating slowly”), she goes for “vibrating steadily.” While Mango translated “caddelerine” as “avenues,” which is literally correct, Gün’s “highways” and subsequently “boulevards” is more appropriate in this context. The protagonist’s city-stroll is not in residential areas but in the outskirts of Istanbul where the distinction between highways and boulevards literally disappears. Also, Gün’s word choice “highways” here is consistent with her use of this word in the rest of the translation. The plot of the novel takes place mostly in busses and on highways across Anatolia. In the same sentence, Gün’s simile “rigid as the arteries of a paralyzed patient” maintains the poetry and the sound of the original. Mango slightly misses the sense of Pamuk’s sentence here and adds his own interpretation with the word “bandits.” This, however, is literally an anachronism for the streets of Istanbul in seventies and eighties. Gün’s translation “with the whine of rowdy trucks” gives the sense of the original better. Gün’s “I consecrated the garbage pails that belched the swill in their maws out on the wet sidewalks that reflected the lights” is the closest one could render the difficult original sentence. Gün’s

translation of this sentence is accurate, poetical, and structurally faithful. In the rest of it, her choice of “gruesome trees,” “asked ... for directions,” “smiled forlornly at drunks, vagrants, unbelievers, and outcasts” are more accurate than Mango’s. “Soluk dükkanlarda” is appropriately “in dimly lit stores,” which is also in line with the general setting and the protagonist’s mood in this section. She avoids the repetition of the word “advertisement” twice and writes “billboards” instead, which does not detract from the meaning. She adds “even” before “in the statues of Atatürk,” adding a stress and emphasizing Pamuk’s ironic remark of juxtaposing pop culture and media with the legacy, myth, and political authority of the republic’s founding leader. Gün’s “papers being scrambled up by drunks and insomniacs” is better than Mango’s literal “tomorrow’s paper fought over by.” Gün’s choice of phrasal verb is consistent with the language she employs in the overall translation as well as with Pamuk’s tone and style. Gün’s more colloquial “Take a load off, young man” for “otur delikanlı” is in line with Pamuk’s intension to depict the talk of the people on the streets and their colloquial language. In the last sentence, Gün’s “innermost stench of the rotting city ... that reeked of the sea” stands out as more poetical when compared to Mango’s “The internal smell of the rotting city ... smelling of sea.” Certainly, Gün’s translation of a single passage has to be viewed in light of and in relation to her entire translation of this novel while Mango’s translation is out of context and his choice of this passage is random.

Comparison of the translations above reveals how demanding a job it is to parse and translate Pamuk’s long and complex sentences. Although discussion of one passage is more revealing than comparing individual words in isolation, still it is limited since it does not reveal the effect of Gün’s entire translation of *The New Life*, which was unduly and unfairly criticized and dismissed by book reviewers.

Scholarly Reception of Güneli Gün's Translation

Esin Erdim's PhD dissertation "The 'Survival' of a Literary Text: The Transformation of Images from the Sublime to the Picturesque in Güneli Gün's Translation of Orhan Pamuk's *Kara Kitap*" is among the unique scholarly studies on Pamuk's novels in translation. She points out that she embarked on her dissertation project because she was disappointed to read Güneli Gün's translation. For Erdim, "the richness of this portrayal [in *Kara Kitap*] seemed to have disappeared [in the translation]. It was this sense of 'loss' that made me want to study the translated text and try to understand what had happened" (1). She argues that the original and the translation signify two different things to two different readers, the Turkish and the Anglo-American. She contends that reading the original Turkish text creates the feeling of "sublime" in the Turkish reader due to the fact that the Turkish reader has the conceptual framework and knowledge to identify the context of the novel. However, she continues, this context is lost in the translation, which transforms "the sublime imagery" of the original into "picturesque" through the translation techniques of "exoticization and naturalization" (192). According to Erdim, the translation creates the effect of "the picturesque," "an experience of controlling the 'other' for a pleasing and charming effect. It is like the gaze of the tourist" (200). After her interview with Gün, conducted on April 13, 1997, in Oberlin, Ohio, Erdim "realized it was Gün's intention to make the novel accessible to an English or target reader that had created this sense of loss [for Erdim]" ("The Visible Translator" 159). Erdim concludes that a "careful comparison of the two texts [Pamuk's *Kara Kitap* and the translation] reveals that Gün sought after the picturesque effect by making use of two translation strategies: exoticization and naturalization, or domestication" (162).

Erdim's study is insightful in that she designs a typology of semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic analyses to study the shifts in the translation. However, she studies the original and translation in an ahistorical and acontextual manner as if the two texts existed in isolation from and irrelevant of the contexts that gave rise to them. Erdim's study demonstrates what Gün has done with the translation. Yet the study stops there. It leaves unaddressed significant questions such as how this translation relates to the previous or to other translations of Pamuk's novels. In this dissertation, the translator and her work are studied in relation to the author and original text thereby contributing to the understanding that translations and translators are and should be subordinate to originals and authors. This is an infantilizing treatment of the translator. It precludes the possibility of envisioning the translator as an independent writer with an authority and insights to make decisions and assume ethical responsibility for the "afterlife" of the original text. Erdim's study can be significantly enhanced by reconsidering Gün's position, not only as Pamuk's translator of *The Black Book* but also as a creative writer, with a unique writerly agenda and style. My study of the translation here contributes to this end.

Güneli Gün's Response to Her Critics

In an essay that appeared in *Times Literary Supplement*, Gün responds to her critics, addressing her experience of translating two of Pamuk's novels, *The Black Book* and *The New Life*. She explains why she has opted for the American English thus: "American diction constantly crosses over class lines, which is what makes it so refreshingly democratic and self-renewing; but I use it simply because I happen to be an American. That doesn't mean I don't go for Britishisms when it suits, like 'drubbing,' for example, a usage that resonates with subtle, class-conscious attitudes of that culture" ("Something Wrong" 12 March 1999, n.p.). Not only

did Gün consciously choose what she finds to be appropriate register and idiom for the translations, she chose to translate novels that are stylistically and temperamentally closer to her concerns as a writer. Both *The New Life* and *The Black Book* deal with the same subject matter and themes as Gün's fiction does. Both Gün and Pamuk are writing in postmodernist style, juxtaposing "high" and "low" languages, showing off literary knowledge through linguistic and philosophical tricks. Both writers challenge the readers' expectations for statuesque symmetry and structure in the novel, playing with that symmetry to reflect the phenomenological and semantic chaos of the world it expresses. Both of them indulge in anachronisms, ransacking the archives of history that are concealed under the debris of religious and nationalist ideologies. Gün admits that she identified with Pamuk's literary persona due to the social and educational background they share ("Something Wrong" 12 March 1999). She spent two years translating *The Black Book* and more than a year on *The New Life*, toil that is too readily discarded and obliterated in book reviews. Reflecting on her experience translating *The New Life*, she writes "Like Pamuk, I too had been carried away by the rhapsodic if slightly stilted language of the earlier English translations of Rilke's *Duino Elegies* and Dante's *La Vita Nuova*. In certain passages where I needed to pull the reader along with the febrile intensity of unrequited love, I decided to go for a whiff of lilac that wafted in from the 19th century, giving the prose that hypnotic ecstasy of 'abnormal' language" ("Something Wrong" 12 March 1999).

Gün is aware of the cultural hegemony in the field of translation that favors Anglo-Saxon words over the Latinate. She consciously strives against such homogeneity and asserts her uniqueness by avoiding easy transliteration and transparency. Well-read in Turkish and Middle Eastern literary traditions, Gün identifies Pamuk's allusions to these traditions. Her broad

vocabulary in English and its cognates allows her to find parallels to Pamuk's language in English:

It seems a pity not to harness the power of Latin when you consider Pamuk's work is thematically and temperamentally linked to the epoch's important Latin writers, such as Italo Calvino, Jorge Luis Borges, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Julio Cortazar and Mario Vargas Llosa. When the translators of these writers allow themselves to go for the obvious cognate, the clarity and precision of Latin rubs up against the muscle of idiomatic English, creating a frisson that used to thrill the great Borges. I get chills from it myself, so I wanted to provide that textual pleasure for Pamuk's prose. ("Something Wrong" March 12, 1999)

Güneli Gün

Güneli Gün is a translator and a Turkish American writer who lives and teaches in the United States and writes in English. She was born in Urfa, a city close to the source of the Euphrates, attended the American Girls' High School in Izmir, and earned degrees from Hollins College in Virginia, the University of Iowa Writers' Workshop, and the John Hopkins University Writing Seminar. She has taught creative writing and women's studies at Oberlin College for many years. Her first creative work, *Book of Trances: A Novel of Magic Recitals* was published in 1977 (hereafter *BT*). Her second novel, *On the Road to Baghdad: A Picaresque Novel of Magic Adventures, Begged, Borrowed, and Stolen from the Thousand and One Nights* (hereafter *ORB*), was published in 1991 and has been translated into Turkish by Aysel Morin as *Bağdat Yollarında: Binbir Gece Masalları'ndan Ödünç Alınmış, Çalınmış ve Uyarlanmış Sihirli Serüvenlerden Oluşan Pikaresk Roman*. Currently she is working on two novels, *My Cousin*

Justine, on terrorism and counterterrorism in the Middle East, and *Temple at Metamora*, a mock-Gothic tale set in modern-day Ohio, and a biography of her mother, *Too Much Ardour: The Memories of Lady Ardour, My Mom*, which is an oral history of the early years of the Turkish Republic. Gün is the translator of three major Turkish novels into English, Pamuk's *The Black Book* and *The New Life*, and Bilge Karasu's *Night*. She won the 1997 National Prize of the American Literary Translators Association for her translation of *The New Life*. In her autobiographical essay "On Quarantine Island," Gün explains how her life and career have been shaped by the elite American education she received in Turkey and abroad. Education, formal and informal, has played significant role in shaping her writings and her relationship with the Turkish and English languages (Gün "On Quarantine Island" 134).

In book reviews, it is often ignored that Gün is not only a translator but also a creative writer who has adopted the Anglo-American language as her literary language. This aspect of the writer-translator has an enormous impact on how she positions herself as a writer and translator, and in respect to her audience. This also has given rise to a unique prose style and subject matter in her own fiction. Her relationship with her native and adopted languages is subtly revealed in her two novels *Book of Trances* and *On the Road to Baghdad*. A close study of these two novels is essential to understanding and explaining Gün's position as a writer and translator, and in turn, to counteracting some of the criticism directed against her translation of *The Black Book*. Viewed under this light, the argument that Gün adopted the techniques of "exoticization and naturalization" in her translation of *The Black Book* becomes simplistic (Erdim 192).

Gün's temperament, style, and background are reflected in her own novels, both thematically and stylistically. These qualities are also revealed in and can be used to explain her translation choices in *The Black Book* and *The New Life*. As a Turkish writer who writes in

American English, an adopted language, she is very self-conscious and feels vulnerable. As a writer, she does not have a “natural” audience (“Turks Are Coming”). She strives to create one, not by following the mainstream literary trends of her adopted language but by creating a unique style of her own. She is concerned with issues of reception and appeal to a new audience in her host literary context. Thus, the position she occupies as a writer and translator is very different from that of Pamuk’s in Turkey and from other writers competing on the American literary scene. This is another factor one needs to consider when evaluating her translation. Given that Gün is a Turkish writer writing in English and a translator translating from Turkish into English, it is would be an oversight to study her translations independently from her fiction.

Güneli Gün as a Writer

By the time Gün translated Pamuk’s novels, she had already established herself as a creative writer in the United States with her two novels, *Book of Trances* and *On the Road to Baghdad*, which were favorably reviewed even in the *Times Literary Supplement*, where her translations were criticized. I argue that a close study of Gün’s fiction reveals her thematic and stylistic preoccupations as a creative writer. More importantly, it reveals thematic and stylistic similarities between Gün and Pamuk, explains Gün’s translation choices in *The Black Book*, and counteracts reviewers’ criticism regarding her linguistic and literary skills.

In her novels, like Pamuk, Gün employs postmodern literary techniques to express themes related to Turkish, Ottoman, and Middle Eastern histories and cultures. According to her, this approach is the only way to create accessibility and audience for Turkish literature on the world literary scene. She lauds Pamuk for sharing the same concerns with her in Turkish. As she points out, “If fantasy or cleverness is the only vehicle on which Turkish literature can arrive

upon the world scene, well then, all the more power to Orhan Pamuk” (“The Turks Are Coming” 43). Due to the thematic and stylistic affinities Gün recognized between her novels and Pamuk’s, she was excited to be granted the opportunity to translate *Kara Kitap* into English. She expressed her disappointment with the “village novel,” a genre that came to occupy the literary scene in Turkey before 1980s postmodernist writing. The “village novel” narrates allegories of social revolution and rebellion, where social and class conflict takes precedence over individual concerns and inner psychological conflict. Their culture-specific concerns attracted little international interest and almost no translation into other languages.³⁵

The post-1980s novels, of which Pamuk’s *Kara Kitap* is the primary representative, employed the literary techniques of fragmentation, paradox, and unstable narrative and narrators, often playfully eschewing the possibilities of and parodying any quest for stable meaning. In these novels, metafictional and intertextual tricks further question the author’s authority and claim for unique craft and originality. From this perspective, these novels resembled and often emulated the literary trends in Europe and therefore were translatable. Both Pamuk and Gün’s writings carry these characteristics although they write in two different languages.

Gün’s two novels reveal her thematic preoccupations and the literary style she has developed to express her concerns. Gün is very self-conscious that she is writing in a language other than her native Turkish. Her novels reveal her superb skills in the English language and the

³⁵ The pre-1980s Turkish novel, what came to be called “the village novel,” was too culture specific and of little interest to international audience. It depicted injustices suffered by Anatolian peasants, represented as innocent victims against opportunistic oppressors. This genre, often historically grounded and based on the use of actual documents, addressed bleak economic hardship, blood feuds, patriarchy, honor, outlaws and the cruelty of gendarmes, petty officials and exploitation by landowners (Gökner “The Novel in Turkish” 489). Fakir Baykurt and Talip Apaydin are the most important representative of this genre. Yaşar Kemal’s *İnce Mehmed* (1955) [Mehmet, my Hawk] is a prototype of the genre. Kemal Tahir’s trilogy *Yediçınar Yaylası* (1968) [Seven Plane Tree Plateau], *Köyün Kamburu* (1959) [The Village Hunchback], and *Büyük Mal* (1970) [The Big Deal]; Orhan Kemal’s *Bereketli Topraklar Üzerine* (1954) [On Bountiful Lands], Tarık Buğra’s *Küçük Ağa* (1963) [The Little Agha] are among the representatives of this genre.

nonnative writer's self-conscious precision with vocabulary, contrary to what her critics have claimed. As I demonstrate below, she employs European and Latin American literary techniques to address Turkish, Ottoman, and Middle Eastern historical and philosophical themes. Her novels engage with Ottoman and pre-Ottoman Turkic history and culture as well as with pre-Islamic philosophical understandings and more precisely with Sufi mysticism. All this resourcefulness and careful knitting of world literary concerns reveals her self-consciousness regarding her position as a writer.

One theme she constantly returns to and thereby underlines is the language reforms that took place in Turkey during the early 1920s. Gün's fictional characters are marked by and handicapped by these reforms, which is Gün's ironic comment on nation building in Turkey. Living away from Turkey and writing in a language other than her native language have provided Gün with the critical distance necessary to comment insightfully on the limitations of modern Turkish history. Her fiction critically revises the historical record and reveals how it actually delayed the emergence of Turkish literature on the world literary scene. She has commented that the modern Turkish language in use in Turkey today is dry and "not as rich as English" (in Erdim 215). By "English," she means the possibilities that Latin, Greek, and old German cognates allow the English speaker to employ various synonyms, create different registers, and thus generate a multiplicity of associations, allusions, and echoes to the literatures of these languages. By "modern Turkish," she means the "new" Turkish language that came about after it was purged of words with Arabic and Persian roots. During the Ottoman era, because of the multiplicity of linguistic and cultural influences on Turkish, the language abounded in synonyms, cognates, and word combinations. The purging left the language dry and colorless, and resulted in repetitive texts, literary or otherwise. Born in a generation that

witnessed the results of the language reforms in Turkey, Gün is harshly critical of Kemalist reforms.

The main objective of Atatürk's language reform was to cleanse the Turkish language of Arabic and Persian influence. The reform expunged words with Arabic and Persian roots, replacing them with Turkish synonyms. Left behind is a Turkish language that needs invention on a daily basis. This depleted language resulted in a dry literature whose readers were the first generations of the new nation and who were violently cut from the archives of Ottoman Turkish, overnight. An analogy to this phenomenon would be an English language in which all English words of Latin, Greek, French, and German origins were purged and replaced with new words based on pure Anglo-Saxon roots. Since Turkish is an inflected language, it is possible to keep building new words on old Turkic stems, which is how the new Turkish was intended to be enriched. However, when in a sentence word after word is loaded up with endless suffixes, sometimes adding as many as seven syllables, the effect is harsh and unreal: "görebiliyormusunuz" (the word coined to mean "can you see"). In this example, the single-syllable stem "gör" (to see) is connected with six suffixes. A similar example is "görüntülendirebiliyormusunuz" ("can you picture it"). In this case, the verb "gör" is attached to two new suffixes to coin the noun "görüntü" ("image"). The verb "görüntü(-le)-n-dirmek" ("to have it pictured") is derived from the noun "görüntü" with the derivative suffix (-le), the reflexive (-n), the agentive (-dir), and finally, the verb conjugative (-mek). This is a dry language and unlike the spoken Turkish idiom. Since these words are newly invented, they carry no emotional weight in the sensibility of the people, either. This is why Gün finds the English language to be "richer" than the newly invented Turkish (in Erdim 212). This is one historical theme this writer reworks and harshly criticizes in her novels.

Both of Gün's novels demonstrate thematic and stylistic affinities with *The Black Book*. Both Gün and Pamuk engage with Ottoman historical themes. In their novels, the multilingual and multicultural society of the Ottoman era is contrasted with the ideologies of the modern Turkish Republic. Both writers engage with the conflicts and ironies that emerge from the seemingly abrupt break from the Ottoman past and entry into the modern Turkish era. Specifically, they focus on the impacts of this particular historical formation on language and identity. Pamuk and Gün write in two different languages, but what they do with language is similar: Pamuk probes the limits of the official syntax in Turkish, challenges commonly adopted linguistic structures, and mixes high and low language registers while Gün consistently uses Latin, Greek, and old German vocabulary in a way that goes beyond everyday American usage. She inserts into her narratives phrases and idiomatic sayings from Turkish by literally translating them into English thereby creating a defamiliarization where the meaning of the phrase is clear yet the way it is articulated "scratches the ear."

Both of these writers mix high and low language registers and juxtapose the written word with expressions from oral traditions. Pamuk and Gün write fiction in ways that question and undermine the pretense for authority in revisionist histories. Through unstable narratives and multiple narrators, Pamuk and Gün question official historical records and undermine their own authorial voices in their novels. Both of them depict identity issues as processes in the making. They make allusions to Sufi literary and philosophical texts thereby revealing their affinities with the mystical dimensions of Islam away from religious orthodoxies.

Following is a brief overview of Gün as a creative writer based on her two novels *Book of Trances* and *On the Road to Baghdad*. This will show the literary and thematic similarities between Gün and Pamuk, challenge some book reviewers' comments that Gün's affinity with the

English language is “debatable,” and further support my argument that Gün’s translation was inaccurately evaluated and criticized.

Book of Trances

Güneli Gün’s first novel, *Book of Trances: A Novel of Magical Recitals*, was published in 1979 by a small British press, Julian Friedmann (Blake Friedmann since 1982). A significant archival work of unofficial memories, *BT* is out of print today and there is no scholarly work published about this book.³⁶ The novel opens with a note indicating that the publisher “decided to retain the author’s American spelling” without further explanation (i). Although seemingly insignificant and irrelevant to the novel itself, this is an important note. It is an honor to the author’s choice of spelling words in American English since British presses almost uniformly change American spelling into British. We can understand the author’s choice better when we consider one of Gün’s statements regarding languages. In her essay “Something Wrong with the Language,” Gün wrote that American diction “crosses over class divisions” and is “democratic and self-renewing” in comparison to British English. This, she writes, is one of the reasons why she adopted the American idiom in *The Black Book*. Close analysis of *Book of Trances* reveals what exactly Gün means by this and why it is significant to her to write in American idiom.

To the foreword of *Book of Trances*, Gün writes, “My intention was to give the reader the illusion of being able to read Turkish, the beloved, recalcitrant tongue I’ve so inexplicably abandoned” (1). This foreword is a significant clue to the reader in grasping this otherwise complex novel. Without paying attention to such clues, the reader might fail to appreciate or

³⁶ *Book of Trances* is very briefly mentioned by William Roggan in “The 1992 Neustadt International Prize for Literature: Jurors and Candidates,” *World Literature Today*, 66:1 (1992, Winter), p. 70; and positively reviewed by Rosalind Wade in “Contemporary Reviews,” *Quarterly Fiction Review*, 236:1368 (1980: Jan), p. 45; and by Djelal Kadir in “Turkish Family Romance,” *World Literature Today*, Winter 1992, Vol. 66, Issue I.

understand this novel, which one reviewer described thus: “despite a rather annoyingly elusive quality, the work as a whole has undeniable charm and individuality” (Wade 45). One is tempted to ask why Gün does not write in her native tongue. I content that Gün’s “inexplicable” decision to turn away from the “recalcitrant” Turkish to Anglo-American is a result of her disappointment with the linguistic impoverishment that took place during the language reforms in early 1920s. Furthermore, Gün left her native country, Turkey, permanently and moved to the United States, which one can explain with reference to the equally violent land reforms that took place in the early years of the republic. These historical events are traumatic experiences that Gün alleviates through writing. *Book of Trances* enacts the illusion of reading as if it were written in Turkish on several levels: plot, theme, narrative construct, characterization, stylistics, syntax, and choice of vocabulary and idiomatic expressions.

The title, *Book of Trances*, reveals the dreamlike quality of the narrative. The novel is about the passage of time, radical transformations, and the stupor left on communities as a result of these changes. The subtitle “Magic Recitals” suggests “magical realism,” the narrative strategy attributed to South American writers and especially associated with Gabriel García Márquez and his novel *One Hundred Years of Solitude*. Magical realism is the literary style of blending magical and factual elements into the narrative. It has been adopted by writers of the so-called Third World as a means to express and narrate experiences different from that of the First World. Writers of magic realist narratives fuse the magical and the realist points of view to form a new perspective. Scholars have described this style as a “disruptive narrative device” that explores and transgresses ontological, political, geographical, and/or generic boundaries (Bowers 4). The author’s intervention is invisible and the narrator is more often than not a third-person

omniscient. The reader is carried to another world, as if magically. Events of the plot occur beyond easy explanation and commonly accepted cause-and-effect rationale, in a way magically.

Gün makes use of the magic realist device extensively in *Book of Trances*. She creates a world in which there is no place for the scientific and the pragmatic. Characters are motivated exclusively by communal beliefs, local values, and traditions and cultural, religious, and social practices. There is no place for logic, reason, and explanation in this world. This aspect of the narrative throws into perspective today's world guided by science and pragmatism. It is not a surprise that Gün dedicates the first chapter of her novel to Gabriel García Márquez "for providing the yeast." Gün acknowledges García Márquez, the master of storytelling, whom she owes the skill of telling magical stories rooted in reality. She dedicates the second chapter to "Idries Shah whose Work is Remembering." This dedication points to the centrality of remembering and forgetting in this narrative and the place of memory in the writing of history, which the novel probes. Idries Shah, author and teacher of Sufi mysticism, played a significant role in presenting Sufism to Europe as a secular, individualistic form of spiritual wisdom.

Gün's novel opens thus:

At that time Ah-istan was feverishly pre-occupied with itself. The world was so old that things had too many names; in order to point to objects it was necessary to confabulate in seven layers of speech. Every year during the month of September an order of tranquil dervishes would arrive to sit in contemplation under the domes of the ruined caravanserai, and with the sonorous music of the wooden flutes and cymbals, they would embody the dance of the heavenly spheres. A reed-like dervish with a silken beard and large freckled hands, known as Dervish Patience, although no one ever heard him introduce himself, was said to be the master of all the Illumined Ones. (*BT* 3)

Gün creates a fabulous world concerned with the concepts of time, place, and language. For instance, she coins the word “Ah-istan” from the onomatopoeia “ah-” and the common Turkish suffix “-istan.” The natives of this land often utter the sound “Ah-” in times of frustration, and “-istan” is a productive suffix in Turkish, meaning “the land of,” and often added to an adjective to form a noun signifying a people’s land. For instance, “Yunan-istan” for Greece, meaning “the land of Greeks,” or “Bulgar-istan,” for “Bulgaria,” “the land of Bulgarians,” and so forth. This strategy allows the writer to reveal how lands were named traditionally and before the rise of the nation-states: literally after the name of the community populating them. In turn, it is an ironic comment on the modern nation-states, which, under the name of the nation, imply a homogenous society stripped away from its diverse ethnic and linguistic realities. Gün’s affinities are with linguistic communities rather than national formations based on political divisions.

Underlying her literary techniques, inventiveness, fabulation, language games, tricks, playfulness, and parody in this novel is the writer’s vigorous attempt to fictionalize and problematize historical events of nation building in Turkey. Aside from demonstrating Gün’s mastery in these linguistic and literary elements, the passage above reveals her style, manner of storytelling, and distinctive diction, which recall the strategies she employs in her translation of *The Black Book*. Words such as “confabulate,” “tranquil,” “sonorous,” “cymbal,” “reed-like,” and “freckled” reveal that Gün opts for vocabulary that comes from Latin, Greek, and old German. This choice immediately establishes the difference between her novel and mainstream Anglo-American fiction, which often use standard Anglo-Saxon words. One striking example of Gün’s careful selection is the word “ululation” (BT 12). “To ululate” in English means to make a long, loud, mournful sound, to hawl or to wail. In Turkish, “ulumak” also means “to wail loudly” (*Çağdaş Türkçe Etimoloji Sözlüğü*) although the word is more often used in association with the

loud noise wild animals make. Gün does not miss the opportunity to pun on a word that points to commonalities in two languages, Turkish and English, which otherwise are extremely different. In line with Gun's overall agenda, I see this word choice as the writer's intention to reveal the linguistic approximation of these two languages.

Even though writing in English, Gün succeeds in capturing the idiomatic flavors of the Turkish language in this novel. Employing literal translation from Turkish into English, she introduces the English reader to Turkish proverbs and adages. For instance, one of the characters in the novel comments on the effects of the First World War thus: "I have a feeling that the pumpkin will explode over our heads" (in Turkish "kabak bizim başımıza patlayacak"; 98). Sometimes the author retains Turkish words in their original forms while at other times she transliterates. For instance, she writes "*jirid* stick" coined from the Turkish word "cirit," meaning "javelin" and referring to the traditional javelin throwing competition resembling wrestling (87). At other times, she retains Turkish words, revealing their meaning semantically: "Kara Bela which means the-black-thing-that-will-be-the-end-of-us-all" (94). These two examples, among many others, employ writing as translation and bridge Turkish and English in creative ways. These examples are only two of the many similar devices Gün employs in her novel "to give the reader the illusion of being able to read Turkish."

Gün's affinity is with storytelling rather than history. Fiction, for her, is the sole means to narrate history and its peculiarities. She concludes her novel, paying tribute to storytelling through a common formula: "Because three apples fell out of the sky: one for the teller who told the story first, one for the listener whose patience exceeds Job's, and one for me" (147). Here, the writer clearly distances herself from the narrator, who, in the previous pages of this book, revealed hidden insights, forbidden truths, and a disavowed past. Nevertheless, as her first novel,

Book of Trances reveals issues that are of primary importance to this writer: her serious concerns with modern-day Turkey's linguistic, historical, and cultural predicaments. Discussion of other more controversial aspects of *Book of Trances* is beyond the scope of this study. This brief overview is intended to point only to those aspects of Gün's thematic and stylistic characteristics that explain some of her strategies in *The Black Book*. It suffices to say that although *Book of Trances* has not been translated into Turkish yet, it has potential to stir controversies at "home."

On the Road to Baghdad: A Picaresque Novel of Magical Adventures, Begged, Borrowed, and Stolen from the Thousand and One Nights

Gün's second novel, *On the Road to Baghdad* (Hunter House, 1991), reveals how she copes with her "vulnerable" position as a writer on the world literary scene, at a deeper level than her first novel (Gün quoted in Erdim 212). Gün offers an introduction and an afterword to the novel where she comments on the "strange tale" she has written (*ORB* 355). She adds a geographical map and a "historical note" at the end of the book. The introduction contextualizes the story, the afterward comments on the novel's thematic preoccupations, and the historical note clarifies historical characters, places, dates, and facts. A well-known and highly respected literary authority in Turkey and in the United States, Talat Halman, writes a preface to the novel. Halman lauds the author for her mastery in storytelling and literary accomplishments, which he finds comparable to renowned world authors. All three of these strategies are intended to bring this "strange tale" close to the reader, clarify what might be perceived as difficult to understand, and increase its readership. All three are signs of Gün's self-consciousness as a Turkish writer, writing in an adopted language, the American idiom, and competing on the world literary scene.

Prefacing the novel for the American reader, Talat Halman writes, “*The Road to Baghdad* is a more sophisticated an alternative to *The Satanic Verses*. Rushdie launches a frontal attack; Gün circumvents, which is a more effective way. Rushdie’s is a work of high dudgeon; Gün’s of irrepressible high spirits” (“1001 Turkish Nights” xiv). *ORB* retains many of Gün’s thematic and stylistic preoccupations I discussed earlier in this chapter. The novel is a quest narrative employing the literary technique of storytelling imbued in history and mythology, and revealing the author’s feminist agenda. It narrates the heroic journey of the minstrel Hürü, a symbol and embodiment of the history, culture, poetry, and faith that belonged to the nomadic Turks before and after their conversion to Islam. Structurally, the novel consists of four parts: departure, initiation, return, and freedom to live. All of these stages follow the epic formula of call for adventure, facing obstacles, overcoming them, and receiving the boon. Hürü’s ultimate boon is her reunion with family, husband, and child with the help of her magical lyre. Between the points of departure and arrival, Constantinople and Baghdad, the writer entertains the reader with various stories, narrated in the manner of the well-known *Canterbury Tales*, *Decameron*, and *A Thousand and One Nights*. These stories reveal various historical, cultural, and linguistic flavors of the people who populate that area.

The novel narrates the time and culture of the early Ottoman Turks, a history known to the European world mostly through erroneous stereotypes. This novel challenges this knowledge. Gün blends the Turks’ nomadic values with the Ottoman imperial cultural ones. She suggests that Islam was not able to penetrate to the core of the “Turkish culture,” contrary to assumptions. This unique culture remained distinct and separate, especially in the countryside, away from the ruling center. As Halman pointed out, this aspect of the narrative poses a threat to the Islamic ideology and implies failure (xiv). Fanatics might consider this as dangerous as heresy. Gün

sides with religious philosophies and mysticism as alternatives to religious orthodoxies. At the same time, her narrative is so irreverent that she lets her characters indulge in various earthly and spiritual pleasures similar to those of the *Thousand and One Nights*.

ORB pays homage to the oral tradition of nomadic Turks that has been repositied in the storytelling technique, a unique way of combining history and fiction. Gün laments that her memory “disappeared once she learned to reason” (*ORB* 356). She reworks that memory through storytelling, writing, and rewriting. The past that Gün wants to reach was penned in Arabic script and banned in modern Turkey in 1923: “Since I couldn’t yet read, the text was read to me by my dad. I still cannot read Arabic script, which was banned in modern Turkey. ... The last time I saw the manuscript, it was among my dad’s medical textbooks Turns out all his papers were sold ... to a candymaker who later admitted that he transformed each paper into a paper sack to vend children afterschool treats” (356). In a self-referential manner, she comments, “The author theorizes that it must have been the Turkish political annexation that stimulated the Arab culture to define and formalize its fictional heritage” (362). I contend that this is the most important reason why for Gün the modern Turkish language, cut from its Arabic origins, never felt like her native language. Rather, she embraced the language that was delivered to her through her American education to tell her stories.

ORB is modeled after the prototypical epic, substituting the male hero with a heroine. Hürü, the female protagonist, has a special name. Its etymology relates to the Turkish word “huri” or “houri,” of Persian origin and referring to the nymphs of the Muslim paradise bound to serve the male gender. The *Oxford English Dictionary* provides a more sensual definition to the word: “a voluptuous beautiful woman.” Gün comes up with an alternative to these denotations by creating a character with a thoroughly liberated soul, far from being a handmaid devoted to

the pleasures of the opposite sex. In addition, the name evokes the word “hür,” which means “free” in Turkish (a word of Arabic origin), a meaning that thoroughly contradicts with the officially accepted ones.³⁷ By the end of her journey, Hürü reaches freedom through ingenious and creative ways such as storytelling, disguise, and her musical talent. The name resonates with the English reader as well. “Hürü” sounds like “hero” and functions as a foil to the stereotypical epic hero. This is another example of Gün’s success in finding approximations between these two etymologically different languages.

Hürü is Gün’s alter ego, as are other characters in the novel such as the Bald Boy (Keloğlan, Hürü in disguise), Scheherazade, and Abd-es-Samad, the fat and unscrupulous alchemist. Hürü entertains others and saves her life with her Stone-Born Lyre, the mythical instrument that first belonged to Orpheus, the legendary musician, poet, and prophet, and then to Homer, the blind bard. Similarly, Gün’s language, American English, is her lyre through which she entertains the reader and carves a niche for herself in the Anglo-American literary scene. Gün creates memorable characters such as Baby Osman, Blowing Bull (literal translation of the Turkish “Esen Boğa”), Barren Aunt (“Kısır Teyze” in Turkish), Deli Kachar (the Turkish for “Crazy Fugitive”), Jann Baath (for John Barth, the American writer), Shehrazad, Shahriyar, and the three Amazons (Lady Zubaida, Lady Amine, and Lady Safiye). These are one-dimensional and stereotypical characters whose names are literal translations from Turkish and denote their functions.

Peoples and cultures of the Middle East are very much blurred in the minds of Europeans and Americans. Gün subtly distinguishes between Turks, Arabs, and Persians through stories that highlight different cultural practices of these peoples. Not only are these people not identical but

³⁷ The word “Hürü” invokes two different Turkish words. “Huri” is a Turkish word of Persian origin, meaning a young woman and is associated with young women believed to exist in paradise. “Hür” is a Turkish word of Arabic origin meaning “free.”

their languages are of distinct origins. Turkish is a Ural-Altaic language, Persian an Indo-European, and Arabic a Semitic. Languages influence thought patterns and cultural practices. Gün's characters tell stories and reveal the distinct practices, ethics, and aesthetics of these people. "Lady Zubaida's Tale," for instance, reveals Afgani traditions, "Lady Amine's Tale" is tailored after Persian narratives, while "Lady Safiye's Tale," tailored after a version that appears in *The Thousand and One Nights* ("The Story of Zumrut") is imbued with Turkish values. Tales narrated by the three Amazons allow for comparison and contrast among the distinct cultural values of Arabs, Persians, and Turks, whose ethnic differences were relatively tolerated during the Ottoman Empire yet eliminated under the project of nation building during the early years of the Turkish Republic.

Gün picks up the legacy of Scheherazade and demonstrates her skills in storytelling. Her literary sources come from *The Thousand and One Nights*, Sufi mysticism, Greek philosophy (Aristotle, Plutarch, Demosthenes), Chinese religious philosophy, the Turkish oral tradition, and the Ottoman history (the reigns of Selim I and Süleyman, the Magnificent). She blends storytelling with historical research in Ottoman and pre-Ottoman eras. Through this unique blend, the writer reveals the irony of the scientific pretention of revisionist histories. In the tradition of the picaresque, the novel narrates episodically Hürü's adventures. She is the rogue, the "Sweet Idiot," as her father calls her, and the clever and attractive *picaro*. She blends historical facts with the types of stories one finds in *Thousand and One Nights*, the prototype of female redemption through storytelling. Scheherazade is the invisible presence behind every story in the novel.

As the final section suggests, this book is a narrative of and about liberation from oppression. Gün's sympathies are with freedom to live. Hürü makes her readers feel that life

itself is liberating. Gün also has a feminist agenda, which is boldly revealed through her heroine. In the historical note appended to the book, Gün writes, “I’m disturbed that Anonymous was a woman. Come right down to it, I’m worried sick. We all are, those of us who think Feminist Thoughts” (*ORB* 359). Gün’s yearning is for freedom and liberation from impositions, which historically restricted the aesthetic expression and enjoyment of the female gender. Similar to Scheherazade who, through skillful storytelling, freed herself from Shahrayar’s misogyny, Gün expresses her freedom through writing in her adopted language, English. As the epigraph to this chapter reveals, Gün identifies herself with writers like Plutarch, who write and experience life through another language and culture.

It is significant to note that the majority of the reviews of this novel, even those published in British newspapers, are highly positive, applauding Gün’s stylistic accomplishments, most of which she applies to her translation of *The Black Book*. John Alexander Allen reviews *ORB* for *Hollins Critic* and highlights what for him is Gün’s strongest aspect as a writer:

Writing in a second language can be a liberating and invigorating asset. Her poetry had verve to spare, but fiction has proved to be Ms. Gün's medium. She tells stories as though born to do so. I say "tells" rather than "writes," because her work is firmly in the tradition of the oral tale. The piquant oddities in her idiom are the perfect medium for the combination in everything she writes of insouciance, earthiness and epithet—the latter often an instrument of hilarious invective. (“On the Road”)

Writing in a second language did not prevent Gün from demonstrating her mastery of language, storytelling, and the oral tradition. Rather, it proves to be the “liberating and invigorating” aspect of her writing and thus contributes to the stylistic refinement of the Anglo-American literary.

Reviewing the novel for *Times Literary Supplement*, Aamer Hussein calls it a “magical chronicle of sixteenth century Baghdad ... an intricately woven tapestry, decorated with the spiritual and poetic metaphors of the great civilizations of the Arabs, the Persians and of their conquerors and inheritors, the Turks.... Though Gün’s self-conscious and often conscientious feminist reworking of history is impressive, it is her reclamation of her native oral tradition that is most compelling” (“Songs of Scheherazade”). Lucasta Miller, who reviews the novel for the *New Statesmen and Society*, writes a highly positive review, and points to the liberating aspects of the narrative:

On the Road to Baghdad offers a compelling combination: the sort of naïve narrative satisfaction you get from a fairy tale, coupled with a sophisticated use of source material. Out of the fables of Hürü the minstrel and Shahrazad the story-teller, Güneli Gün has woven a powerful parable about the capacity of the female voice to free itself from the silence imposed by history. ... If Hürü redeems her macho prince from misogynistic cruelty, Güneli Gün has redeemed Hürü from behind the veil. (“Behind the Veil”)

In his review essay “Turkish Family Romance,” Djelal Kadir points to the thematic and stylistic affinities between Pamuk and Gün, suggesting that Gün is subtly more accomplished: “Pamuk’s *Kara Kitap* ... is an exemplary specimen of hide-and-seek, whereas Güneli’s own *Book of Trances* (1979) and her more recent *On the Road to Baghdad* bend this strategy to exquisite end” (“Turkish Family Romance”). Both Pamuk and Gün employ the metaphor of quest as a means to an end. Pamuk’s ultimate end is the problem of identity within the context of Turkish nationalism and its problematic past while Gün gives the same theme a gender twist, abandoning national specificity. Nevertheless, both writers tap on the resources of Ottoman literary and cultural history. All three texts, *Kara Kitap*, *Book of Trances*, and *On the Road to*

Baghdad “engage with history and writing through the literary techniques of evasion and pursuit” (Kadir “Turkish Family Romance”). Kadir does not miss the opportunity to comment that Gün as a Turkish American writer and *Kara Kitap*’s translator into English is ideally situated for this purpose given her skills in superb storytelling, knowledge in world literature, and having already established herself as a writer of similar thematic and stylistic concerns:

Shahrazad is legion, and Güneli Gün, not unlike her heroine, figures as one of her avatars ... for *On the Road to Baghdad* is a novel that Shahrazad would be proud to have one of her daughters author. Which brings us back to Güneli's comments on Pamuk's *Kara Kitap*, now in her hands, undergoing a rebirth into another language. Cousin Celal's reaction is predictably, one could say impishly, reflexive. After all, he is the one who ran off with the writer's dream. ... what she [Güneli Gün] says has been said by Orhan Pamuk through his prosecutorial and pursuing Galip is what she would have us listen to, or read from her own pen, as we accompany the picaresque heroine of her novel through the centuries of baneful history, enforced metamorphoses, inspired transformations, and breathtaking song. When *On the Road to Baghdad* is born into its Turkish-language life, as it will be shortly, the readers of Orhan Pamuk's *Kara Kitap* will discover that Güneli Gün is not just the commentator of the novel in the pages of *World Literature Today* and its translator and deliverer into English, but could well have been the absconded djinni whose circuitous itinerary has taken her from the "iron-belted people" (as she refers to the folk of Anatolia who engendered her stories) to the "rust belt" of the American Midwest. (“Turkish Family Romance”)

Esin Erdim laments that “the rich and complex portrayal of contemporary Turkish culture ... seemed to have disappeared in the English version [of *The Black Book*]” (*The “Survival”* 1).

As I revealed above, Gün's two novels establish her as a superb storyteller, in excellent command of the English language and its rich vocabulary, knowledgeable about the annals of world literature, and an accomplished and well-received writer herself. Ignoring this aspect of the writer-translator makes Erdim's lament superficial. The feeling of "loss" Erdim experiences is due to a nostalgic loss for the Turkish language that no translation can recover.

Güneli Gün as a Translator

Global book marketing strategies have significantly dominated translation production and circulation. Today, translation research goes beyond studying translations as the sole products of translators, weighing authors', publishers', and editors' control over the translation. Gün's translation of *The Black Book*, however, carries mostly her signature. The editor-in-chief at Farrar, Straus, and Giroux at that time, Jonathan Galassi, was in close agreement with Gün on the translation of *The Black Book*.³⁸ Also, as Pamuk clearly indicates in his interview with Joy Stocke, he approved Gün's translations ("The Melancholy Life"). Thus, it is not an oversimplification to treat the translation of *The Black Book* as Gün's translation decisions, approved by both the editor and the author at the time of publication.

Translating *The Black Book* in 1994, Gün's primary aim was to create a narrative that would function as a literary text for the American readership. Her intention was to increase the readership for Turkish American literature at a time when Pamuk had not received the Nobel Prize and when there was little interest and demand for literary works written in Turkish. She accomplished this not through reinforcing difference but through emphasizing affinities with

³⁸ This information is based on my personal exchange with the editor Jonathan Galassi at "Translatable: Creativity and Knowledge Formation Across Cultures," a conference held jointly at Duke University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, April 23-25, 2009.

dominant literary trends thereby making “strange” themes “digestible.” Gün’s translation reveals her sensitivity to the assumed distance and difference between the Turkish and Western literatures and cultures. Her translation cannot be easily characterized as either “domesticating” or “foreignizing.” Challenging domestic literary and cultural values would not have suited her agenda as a writer and ambassador of the literature of the Turks. In her interview with Erdim, Gün says, “I don’t want to be outrageous because Turkish literature is considered distant and outrageous enough ... so I have to make a text that’s very available. It’s a text that is not sort of homogenized. It’s a text that rings with somebody’s” (“Interview” 213).

Not only as a writer but as a translator, Gün realizes the discriminated position Turkish literature occupies on the world literary scene. Translation is another means for her to access the world literary scene and world audience. As she puts it,

Both Orhan and I, as his translator, are suffering from something that is very peculiar that has to do with the fact that he and I are both trying to compete as equals on the stage of world literature and somehow this is not allowable because we’re just a bunch of Turks who have to be told how to, whether it’s good or not, or somehow they’re supposed to arbitrate what it is we are supposed to write and how we’re supposed to do it, and this is paternalism of some sort, you know, and they can’t do that to Turks because we’ve never been colonized. (Erdim *The Survival* 209)

Gün revolts against tendencies to treat Turkey as a postcolonial nation. She hints about the importance of distinguishing between various historical formations. Despite her somewhat chauvinistic statement above, she is conscious of her role as a translator and writer who wants to compete on the world literary scene and counter homogenizing tendencies. She sees translating Pamuk as benefiting him and introducing Turkish literature to the West. This strategy benefits

Gün as a Turkish American writer, as well. The processes of writing and translating would create an audience for the thematic and stylistic preoccupations that concern both Pamuk and Gün. In the same interview quoted above Gün talks about translating Pamuk's *Kara Kitap* into English in terms of loaning her voice to him and annexing his work to hers, which is "a very sophisticated idea because once I translate it, it gets stamped by my voice, it's his book but it becomes my text so I don't feel like a handmaiden to literature. I feel like I'm doing something that is kind of gutsy" (Erdim 212). This is an activist approach, clearly bearing similarities with Spivak's project of translating works of Mahasweta Devi. Talat Halman has pointed out that American literature has deprived itself for a long time of the Ottoman theme. Translations of Pamuk's novels introduced not only Ottoman but also Turkey-specific themes to world literature thereby refreshing its canons. One such example is the by now well-known image of the city of Istanbul, which I discuss in more detail in chapter 3 in relation to Maureen Freely's translation of *The Black Book*.

As a translator, Gün is aware of the ethics involved in translating from Turkish into English. Although her strategy was to create a text that is "available" to the target reader, she did not create an easy, readable, or fluent text. By "available," she means a text that resonates with the literary archives of the target readers. What make her an "aggressive" translator are those instances in the translation that rewrite the original in a way that connect it with other texts thus creating literary and cultural associations. As she points out, "Some of these people think that translators are like a piece of glass that you look through. In fact, the translator is not a pane of glass. If we're glass, there're flaws in it. And so, it's going to reflect in a different sort of way. So in a sense, I had no compunctions about giving it my voice. So, what I say is accurate but it has been transformed" (214). Gün sees translation as an act of improvement both for the original

text and for the translator: “Every work of translation is an act of love but it’s also an act of criticism” (214). Conscientious translation editors like John O’Brian at Dalkey Archive Press and Jonathan Galassi at Farrar, Straus, and Giroux have also pointed out that every manuscript can be improved, which is the editor’s work; the same applies to translation.³⁹ Applying her unique style as a writer, striking balance between what is considered to be “domesticating” and “foreignizing,” Gün produced a text that carries *Kara Kitap*’s plot and themes into English and emphasizes that text’s affinities with its American and European counterparts.

Güneli Gün’s Translation of *The Black Book*

More can be said about the possibilities of translation after analyzing Gün’s translation of *The Black Book*. Contrary to book reviewers’ evaluative and dismissive reading of the text, Gün’s translation performs a specific function in accordance with the translator’s intention, which is not identical with that of the author’s. The translator’s intention and the function of the translation need to be understood in relation to the immediate context in which the translation process took place. Gün translated the novel at a time when interest in Turkish literature on the world literary scene was scarce⁴⁰ and Pamuk had not yet received the Nobel Prize. In this context, Gün’s translation performs a bridging role between two seemingly distinct languages, literature, and cultures by emphasizing *Kara Kitap*’s intertextual references to world canonical texts, thereby creating identification between Turkish and other literatures.

Gün’s *The Black Book* defies the common binary of translations as being either “domesticating” or “foreignizing” (Venuti). Her role as a translator cannot be defined according

³⁹ Based on my personal correspondence with the editors.

⁴⁰ Turkish literature and Pamuk are still absent from even the most recent discussions on world literature. In Casanova’s acclaimed and widely discussed *La République mondiale des Lettres* (1999) [*World Republic of Letters* (2004)] Pamuk is conspicuous by his absence.

to Schleiermacher's proposition that the translator "either leaves the author in peace ... and moves the reader towards him" or "leaves the reader in peace ... and moves the writer towards him" (49). Gün's translation is characterized by her own position and agenda as a creative writer and cannot be properly explained without considering her unique style and thematic preoccupation as a writer. As I demonstrate below, these elements weigh in and explain her translation strategies in *The Black Book*.

One of the most striking examples of the translator's visibility comes in the first chapter of *The Black Book*, "The First Time Galip Saw Rüya." As I discussed in chapter 1, character names are significant for the proper interpretation of the text. They reveal how Pamuk alludes to works of European and Middle Eastern literary traditions. It is a challenge for the translator to render these names without sacrificing the implications names carry for the entire text. Faced with proper names, translators have two choices. They either retain the original names or they transliterate them in the translating language. That is, they spell the names in another alphabet's characters. Either of these choices has implications on what the target text comes to signify in its new context. Gün translates in a way that calls attention to the text as a construct, a rewriting, and translation. She emphasizes the aesthetic, suggestive, and fictional aspects of the original text. The meaning of the protagonists' names is obvious for the reader of the original text. Pamuk chose these names for their allusions to Ottoman and Middle Eastern literary and cultural sources. Although Gün retains the names as they are (except that she spells "Celal" as "Jelal," the implications of which I discuss below), she has the protagonist Galip look up the meaning of the names in a dictionary of Ottoman Turkish:

Galip has read Rüya's name for the first time on one of the postcards that grandma stuck into the frame of the mirror on the buffet where the liqueur sets were kept. It hadn't

surprised him that Rüya meant “dream”; but later, when they began figuring out the secondary meanings of the names, they were astonished to find in a dictionary of Ottoman Turkish that Galip meant “victor” and Jelal “fury.” (*BB* 9–10)

Gün adds the above passage to make sure that the readers of the translation do not miss the meaning of the names, and their metaphoric and symbolic implications. The translator’s intervention does not change the content of the text in the sense that she does not deviate from the plotline. Rather, she directs the target reader’s attention to the historical and semantic significance of the names, which otherwise might have been lost. Gün highlights the foreignness of the text (“dictionary of Ottoman Turkish”), the fictional and textual aspects of the plot (the surreal moment of characters facing the textual significance of their own names, which determines their fates), and the multiplicity of meanings that resonate within the novel. This creative strategy is in line with the characteristics of the protagonist Galip, who later on looks for clues in Jelal’s newspaper columns to find the whereabouts of his wife and cousin.

In addition to meaning “fury,” “Jelal” also means “divine” and is one of the ninety-nine names of Allah in Islam. Jelal’s family name, Salik, connects with this secondary and more metaphysical meaning, since it means “the traveler on Sufi Road” (*BB* 303). Gün translates the text in a way that the meaning she does not reveal at the beginning, that is, “divine,” gradually unfolds as the identification between Jelal and Mevlana Celaladdin Rumi becomes more apparent. Gün transliterates “Celal” as “Jelal,” a strategy that resonates with the rest of her translation decisions. There is an obvious similarity between Jelal and Jesus. Not only the letter “J” but also Celal’s character traits as a savior figure, who is read devoutly by his readers and eventually gets murdered, support this interpretation. In one of his columns, Jelal develops interest for Hurufism, a mystical kabalistic Sufi doctrine based on the belief that things are

embodied in letters. The word “hurûf” in Arabic literally means “letters of the alphabet” and Jelal’s study of letters and faces gains prophetic proportions in the text. That one of the meanings of “Celal” is “divine” and when transliterated the name recalls the Christian savior figure is an example of phonetic approximation of two languages that otherwise are very distinct. Gün’s translation strategy adds a Christian point of view to the Sufi mystical interpretation of the novel, thus allowing for multiple and mutually compatible interpretations.

In his review of the novel, Robert Irwin has pointed to the Christian point of view in the novel and commented on the Dantean aspects of Galip’s journey (*TLS*). Joan Smith, who reviewed the translation for *The Nation*, comments that it is the writer Pamuk, who reveals the meaning of the names. As I demonstrated above, it is not Pamuk but Gün’s strategic intervention into the text that gives rise to these views. This also supports my point that reading translations as transparent copies of the originals results in erroneous and misleading reviews. There is a need for reviews of translations as translations, acknowledging the translator as the rewriter of the original text.

Another example of Gün’s emphasis on the metafictional and allusive aspects of the original is her translation of chapter 4, “Aladdin’s Store.” Gün transliterates “Alaaddin” as “Aladdin,” which connects this chapter to the story of Aladdin and his magical lamp in *Thousand and One Nights*. In the source text, the purpose of this chapter is to reveal the consumer practices of Istanbulites and their desires for peculiar objects. In Aladdin’s store, one can find anything and everything from badly translated detective novels, to *Texas* and *Tom Mix* comics, little statues of Atatürk, pencil sharpeners in the shape of Dutch windmills, *raki*, plastic dolls, Japanese fountain pens, pistol-shaped cigarette lighters, among others. Structurally, the chapter is Jelal’s second newspaper column, where the reader learns that his memory is fading. Jelal

interviews Aladdin, raising questions about the reasons behind people's strange consumer habits and by the end of the column, reveals Jelal's intention to, one day, write the actual column based on this interview.

The language in the original is extremely repetitive. Sixteen consecutive sentences in the source text end with the verb "anlattım" ("I told him"). Gün alternates expressions such as "I told him," "I confided," "I went on," "I explained" in order to break the monotony. Throughout the chapter, she adds qualifiers such as "I told him how the thousand—*nay*, the ten thousand" (BB 36 emphasis mine), "Take the woman, *for example*, whose nylon sprung a run" (37; emphasis mine), "He hadn't yet said '*nay*' even" (39; emphasis mine), or "to communicate the words he himself couldn't nail down, *say*, for the little celluloid geese" (40; emphasis mine), which are not in the original. Her additions highlight the oral aspects of the narrative and enhance the storytelling quality of the text. This device does not deviate from the plot since, in this chapter, it is either Jelal telling Aladdin his memories related to the store or Aladdin recalling some peculiarities in his customers' habits.

In the translation, Gün employs the style and language of the commoner talking informally. She maintains balance between her choice of archaic words on the one hand and informal and colloquial sayings on the other. She leaves neighborhood names such as "Nişantaşı" and "Teşvikiye" as they are in the original. She leaves "rakı" (anise-flavored traditional Turkish liqueur) as it is in the original and adds "a bottle of" thus making it possible from the context for the reader to understand its meaning. Similarly, she does not explain what "*Hürriyet*" is but she translates the original "Yalnızca *Hürriyet* okuduğunu anlattı" (He explained that he read only the *Hürriyet*) as "As for newspapers, he only read the popular *Hürriyet*," to create a context for the word. Gün's language recreates the chapter in such a way that Aladdin

turns into a magician who procures whatever his customers fancy. She suggests similarities between Aladdin's magical lamp and Aladdin's store through her specific word choice. For instance, when Jelal reveals to Aladdin his intention to interview him before he writes about him in the paper, Aladdin asks, "Ağbi, şimdi bu benim aleyhime mi olacak?" literally "Brother, is this now going to be used against me?" Pamuk here ironically simulates the talk of the common people, who often fear that any testimony they give might be used against them in newspapers or in written records. Gün translates this as "But wouldn't it bring me a lot of grief?" recalling Aladdin's response to the sorcerer in Galland's translation of the *Arabian Nights*.

In the translation, Jelal tells Aladdin his fading memories of the store thus: "the same girls who'd remember *their first star-crossed loves*, although stuck now with children and grandchildren in the insipid kitchens of insipid marriages, and dream of *Aladdin's store like a distant fairy tale*" (36; emphasis mine) for "yıllar sonra, yavan bir evliliğin yavan bir mutfağında çocuklar ve torunlar arasında, mutsuzlukla *ilkgençlik aşklarını* hatırladıklarında, Aladdin'in dükkanını nasıl uzak bir masal gibi *hayal ettiklerini* anlattım" (KK 47; emphasis mine). Gün renders the more literal "high school sweethearts" ("ilkgençlik aşklarını") as "star-crossed lovers," making reference to the "Romeo and Juliet" type of characters in the *Nights*. Gün translates the literal "to imagine" as "to dream," connecting it to the central metaphor of "rüya" ("dream") in the text and enhancing the dreamlike and surreal memories Jelal has of Aladdin's place. As an antidote to Jelal's account, where Aladdin literally becomes a fairy tale character, Aladdin in Gün's translation creates a more realistic picture of himself: "Like all real persons who find themselves snatched into fiction, Aladdin had a *superreal* presence that challenged the world's boundaries and a simple logic that snatched the rules" (BB 37; emphasis mine) for "Hayali hikayeler içine düşmüş bütün gerçek kişiler gibi, Alaaddin'de dünyanın sınırlarını

zorlayan *gerçekdışı* bir yan ve kurallarını zorlayan yalın bir mantık vardı” (KK 48; emphasis mine). In Turkish “gerçekdışı” means “unreal, imaginary,” from “gerçek” for “real” and “-dışı,” the suffix for “away”; thus literally “away from reality.” Gün translates it as “superreal” thereby establishing a starker contrast between the magical figure that comes out of Jelal’s memory and the real person Aladdin is. In addition, Gün adds the remark in italics in the following: “*What drowned one in a flood of sorrow* was the noise of the traffic around Nişantaşı Square and the sound of the music on the radio” (BB 37; emphasis mine). This refers to the mythical Flood, an intertextual reference and strategy that Gün consistently employs in her translation. I am going to discuss similar mythical images later in this section.

In the following quote, Aladdin denies Jelal’s memory and account: “It wasn’t true that he counted the magazines spitting on his fingers; nor was his store out of legends and fairy tales. He was sick of *people’s goofs*. Some poor geezers too, ... to scoop up merchandise on the cheap ... they got angry and started a *ruckus* ... knocked him *of a loop*. He was amazed that the *coat’n tie set* still hadn’t caught on to waiting for their turn; sometimes he couldn’t help *chewing out* some people ... yelling like Mongolian soldiers on a *looting spree*, ... *got into spats* picking lottery tickets ... by *the fat gent* who licked a stamp” (37–38; emphasis mine). Clearly, the style Gün employs to render Aladdin’s perspective is in stark contrast with Jelal’s account. In her translation, the difference between registers is clear-cut, compared to that of the original. She makes sure that Jelal, the columnist, and Aladdin, the storeowner, speak in two different registers and, through her stylistic choices, adds a fictive element to the account.

Gün does not miss the opportunity to add her point that Aladdin is like a Sufi figure when she translates “and he’d search the city, store by store, like a traveler questing after a mystery, until he landed his quarry” for “şehirin içinde bir esrarı aramaya çıkan yolcu gibi, dükkan dükkan

sorup, arayıp bulmuştu” (KK 50). The source text could have been rendered more literally as “like a traveler who searches for a secret in the city, he would search and ask at every store until he finds it.” The simile and the archaic diction “questing after a mystery” and “to land a quarry” resonate with Sufi philosophical texts and concepts that support one of the themes of the novel. They are also a reference to Galip, who searches for his wife just like Aladdin searches for items that his customers demand. Although in the source text Pamuk does not change registers between Jelal’s memory of the store and the way Alaaddin talks about his customers’ consumer attitudes, in the translation the difference between registers is stark. While Pamuk’s text reads steady, monotonous, and repetitive, Gün’s text alternates registers from that of a newspaper writer’s to that of a store owner’s. The translation switches rapidly between registers and creates a faster pace compared to the original.

Another instance that relates to the fictional atmosphere created in this chapter is the way Gün translates the word “bebek,” which means “baby” and “doll.” Pamuk uses the word in relation to the items that Alaaddin sells in his store. The image of the baby doll here is Pamuk’s critique of consumer fetishism. It suggests that subjects and objects, consumers and commodities blend to the point where they become indistinguishable. The polysemy of the Turkish word “bebek” relates to the symbolic universe of *Kara Kitap*, the search for identity being the main theme and the acquisition of objects in order to satisfy this need being a subtheme. All the objects sold in Alaaddin’s store are peculiar items that address this need but can never satisfy the desire for it because they are just substitutes for what Lacan calls the “lost object of desire” (*Ecrits* 221). However, the dolls come to occupy a special place in Alaaddin’s dreams after certain ambiguous characters come to his store to buy a bottle of *rakı* and a doll, and then disappear into the darkness. In Alaaddin’s dreams, the dolls come to life, their eyes moving and

their hair growing. Gün opts for the word “doll,” which relates to the way she translates the rest of the chapter, creating a fairy store and a magician character in Aladdin. It could be argued that the word “doll” also relates to Pamuk’s aim to create an image where objects transform readily into subjects and extend his critique of the consumer fetish. Regardless of the author’s intention, the translator translates this image in a way that readily connects with another image, that of the “mannequins” and their world of cultural stereotypes narrated in the chapter “Master Bedii’s Children.”

In chapter 6, “Bedii Ustanın Çocukları” (“Master/Craftsman/Connoisseur/Artist Bedii’s Children”), Pamuk points to the contradictory effects of Westernization and how it has changed self-perception in Turkey. He relates cultural and social contradictions of Turkish society to the theme of being oneself and being someone else. For this purpose, he creates the image of mannequins who look like traditional Turkish citizens as an object of disgust for Turkish people, who would rather buy clothes displayed on “western” and imported mannequins. Pamuk’s chapter begins with an epigraph from Dante. It is not clear from the epigraph which work Pamuk refers to. Gün adds “The Inferno, Canto IV,” making it clear that this chapter relates to the theme of descent to the underworld in search of a profound knowledge. At the end of the first paragraph, Jelal indicates that he is going to write about the “history of Turkish mannequin making” (BB 52). Pamuk writes, “Türkiye’de mankenciliğin yeraltına itilmiş korkunç tarihinden işte böyle haberdar olduk” (“This is how we found out about the buried and frightening history of mannequin making in Turkey”; KK 64). Gün translates it as “This is how we got wind of the morbid history of Turkish mannequin making, which, *it turns out*, was forced underground” (BB 53; emphasis mine). By adding, “it turns out,” Gün carries the reader into another world, the world of storytelling and narrating. She signals that she is going to narrate a fictional account and

begins the following paragraph with “For centuries.” Pamuk, rather, proceeds by revealing a straightforward account of Celal’s visit to the underworld of the city. That is, Gün’s translation adds an additional layer of storytelling and narration without deviating from the actual plot.

Another example of similar translation decision is the following. Pamuk writes, Üçyüz yıl önce Akdeniz’de İtalyan ve İspanyol gemilerine kök söktüren levendlerimizin ve civan yiğitlerimizin palabıyıkları ve bütün haşmetleriyle, bu ilk müzeye yerleştirildiğini ve saltanat kayıkları ve kadırgalar arasında dikildiğini gören *müzenin ilk ziyaretçileri, tanıkların anlattığına göre*, hayretler içinde kalmışlar. (KK 64; emphasis mine)

Gün translates thus:

According to eyewitness accounts, the guests at the museum’s opening were astounded to see our two-fisted corsairs and our strapping valiants who routed Italian and Spanish galleons in the Mediterranean some three hundred years ago erect in all their glory, bristling with handlebar mustaches, and placed in between the royal launches and the men-of-war. (BB 53; emphasis mine)

By beginning the sentence thus, Gün emphasizes that the “account” is a construct and therefore mediated rather than narrated by the eyewitnesses themselves, which is how it is in the original. Also, by opting for this specific diction and vocabulary, “two-fisted corsairs,” “strapping valiants,” “erect in all their glory,” “bristling with handlebar mustaches,” “royal launches,” Gün recreates the historical side of the source text and gives it a mythical and archaic aura. A couple of paragraphs later, Gün writes, “In his curious house in Kuledibi (where I was taken)” (BB 53). Although there is not a parenthetical remark in the source text, Gün adds one to remind the reader that, in fact, the fictional and mythical world Gün has created has been narrated by Jelal,

the columnist. Similarly, the Dantean descent underground is made very clear and specifically highlighted in Gün's translation while it is vague in Pamuk. The source text simply states, "Kuledibi'ndeki çamurlu bir yokuştan, çarpık merdivenli berbat bir kaldırımdan geçerek *indiğimiz* soğuk ve karanlık bir evin bodrumundaydık" ("we ... descended," *KK* 66; emphasis mine). Gün translates thus: "We stood in the basement of the cold and dark house, where we had come after *a descent down* a muddy slope *below the huge Galata Tower* and after walking on a filthy sidewalk and crooked stairs" (*BB* 54; emphasis mine). Although "Kuledibi" is the vicinity of "Galata Tower" in Istanbul, in Gün's text, the "descent down" from a major tower highlights the central event of going into the underground vaults of the mannequin workshop.

What follows is Jelal's description of the mannequins among which he even finds his own replica: "my likeness also existed. Even I was present in that moth-eaten abject darkness" (56). This uncanny event reveals the moment when subjects and objects blend to extreme proportions. It relates to Gün's decision to translate "bebek" (which literally means "baby" and not "kukla," which would correspond to "doll") as "doll." Gün recreates the strange event of some shady men coming to Aladdin's store for a doll and a bottle of *rakı* by giving it an uncanny feeling through her word choice. Jelal's description of the almost-alive mannequins "struggling to wiggle and fidget" reaches extreme proportion when with "the terror of a 'wolf child'" (56) he sees his look-alike mannequin. Pamuk's "vahşi çocuk" (*KK* 69), which literally means "wild child," is "wolf child" in Gün's text, suggestive of Freud's case study of the "Wolf-man" and "Little Hans." This and other similar translation decisions on Gün's part relate Aladdin's uncanny dreams of dolls coming to life and growing hair to Jelal's experience of coming face-to-face with a look-alike mannequin, an exact replica of himself. In the original, the link is not readily established. Again, in Gün's translation the two planes of illusion and reality, fact and

fiction, story and history, are in greater contrast than in the original. The translation calls attention to itself as a translation, involving the act of rewriting.

In the same chapter, there is a paragraph with multiple references to the Sufi mystical tradition through vocabulary such as “folkloric, Master, patronage, prodigies, Sheikh of Islam” (52–53). Gün translates “Mankenciliğimizin *piri* ... Bedii Usta” as “*the patron saint of mannequin making was Bedii Usta*” (53; emphasis mine). “Pir” is a title of a Sufi teacher or leader; Gün gives it a Christian flavor by translating it as “patron saint,” thus mixing religious references. Later in the novel she translates “abdâl” (literally “dervish”; *KK* 409) as “dervîş saint” (*BB* 370). This relates to my point that Gün intended to create a niche for Turkish literature on the world literary scene by establishing a bridge between different cultural and religious practices, a point I am going to further exemplify below.

How Gün handles names of different neighborhoods in Istanbul and especially the family-owned apartment support my proposition that the translation cannot be characterized as either “foreignizing” or “domesticating,” “picturesque” or “exotic.” Gün retains the street and neighborhood names in Turkish and transliterates the family building “Şehr-i Kalp” as “Heart-of-the-City Apartments.” “Şehr-i Kalp” carries a metaphoric and intertextual significance for the source text. The reference is to Şeyh Galip’s *Hüsn-ü Aşk*, where Aşk (Love) has to prove himself worthy of Hüsn (Beauty) by undergoing the trials of a journey to Diyar-i Kalp (the Land of Heart). The metaphoric reference is that in order to find himself/his dream/Rüya/Celal, Galip has to reach “Şehr-i Kalp Apartmanı,” where Celal’s “memory banks” or writings are stored. “Şehr-i Kalp” suggests “Diyar-ı Kalp” not only because of the word “kalp” but because of the grammatical construct (Persian-izafet), which is uncommon and considered archaic in contemporary Turkish usage. This building stands in one of the renowned neighborhoods of

Istanbul, indicating that the family, like Pamuk's own, used to be quite wealthy. Also, from Celal's writings, we learn that this is the place where there was a hunting lodge for the princes during the Ottoman Empire and where the honorable crown prince Osman Jelalettin spent twenty-two years of his life dictating to his scribe his discovery that the most important thing in life is to be oneself. The name, chosen by the family, meaning "the heart of the city," reveals the family's perception of itself as important and central to the rest of the city. Originally, the words "şehir" and "kalp" come from Arabic. The expression "Şehr-i Kalp" is a noun phrase made with the Persian grammatical rule where "the qualifier follows the qualified, the opposite of the Turkish usage, and the qualified is joined to its qualifier, noun or adjective, with an *i*" (Lewis 51). Following the Turkish rule, the phrase would be "Şehrin Kalbi." Lewis calls this rule the "Persian *izafet*."

Gün translates "Şehr-i Kalp Apartmanı" as "Heart-of-the-City Apartments." She sacrifices the reference to Şeyh Galip's work. However, by revealing the meaning of the phrase semantically, she retains the reference to the prosperous past of the family. Her choice links the family abode and the family name symbolized by the abode to a familiar theme in American literature. Writers such as Nathaniel Hawthorne in *The House of the Seven Gables* and Edgar Allen Poe in *The Fall of the House of the Usher* wrote novels in which the fall of a house symbolizes the degradation of a prosperous family. In addition to this, in Gün's text, the Heart-of-the-City apartment turns into a mythical and haunted abode, which brought nothing but bad luck to the family. The first time Pamuk introduces Şehr-i Kalp Apartmanı, he reveals the unfortunate past of the family building by referring to it as simply "uğursuz" ("unfortunate, bringing bad luck"; KK 15), using the term twice. In the source text, the unfortunate state of the building is related to the fast pace of modernization and the rapid change of the flat owners: "the

little boutique gynecologist, who performed abortions on the sly, and insurance office ... the building's dark and mean façade" (7). Gün translates the word "uğursuz" as "jinxed" (BB 7), and this uncommon word choice becomes even more noticeable when it repeats three times in one paragraph. Gün's "Heart-of-the-City" apartment suggests a fairy place, one that is haunted, doomed, and controlled by dark forces. The way this image develops in the translation is also supported by how Gün decides to translate another image, "apartman karanlığı" (literally "the apartment darkness"), as "apartment airshaft" and "the dark void."

Chapter 8, "The Dark Void," is another example where Gün's translation choices highlight the uncanny and suggestive aspects of one image, the apartment airshaft. First of all, she translates the title "Apartman Karanlığı," which literally means "Apartment Darkness," and relates it to a specific location in the building, that is, the apartment airshaft, when she calls it "The Dark Void." By opting for "The Dark Void," Gün highlights the physically and metaphorically dead-end aspects of this location in the building. In her translation, the apartment airshaft is literally and metaphorically a dark and secret spot. In this chapter, through the image of the apartment airshaft, Pamuk intends to express his critique of fast modernization that has covered the city of Istanbul with ugly architecture. Pamuk's airshaft is symbolic of the dirt and filth, accumulating all over the city. Symbolically, the apartment airshaft suggests dark secrets in the family history. Celal and his mother used to live in Şehr-i Kalp Apartmanı before they were thrown out by his father's new family although Celal is the rightful inheritor of the building. The dark, dirty, and hidden spot in the family abode stands for the family's past wrongs. Intertextually, it relates to Şeyh Galip's *Beauty and Love* (one of the trials that Love has to overcome) and Rumi's *Mathnawi* (the pit where Shams of Tebriz was found dead).

Gün recreates the image as part of the fantastic and suggestive world she has emphasized so far. Early in the chapter, she translates “Bir masal kuyusu gibi” (literally “like a well in a story,” *KK* 203) as “like a well in a tale of fantasy” (*BB* 180) thus situating the unrealistic image of the airshaft into a dark tale of fantasy. The source text emphasizes the ugliness of this location and the dirt that accumulates in it, while Gün’s text recreates this as an existential image, a certain dark area in the human condition. She uses the expressions “the dark void” and “the apartment airshaft,” alternately, thereby establishing the semantic link between them. Esin Erdim reads this aspect of the translation as introducing a new cultural phenomenon: “Through this strategy a foreign image ‘the apartment airshaft’ is introduced into the target culture” (“Survival” 156–57). However, airshafts are not foreign images for Anglo-American readers. One finds airshafts in overcrowded big-city buildings across the globe. Rather, Gün did not allow the pun in the expression “Apartman Karanlığı” to get lost. “Apartman Karanlığı” stands for both the specific location in the building, “the airshaft,” and, due to the word “karanlık” (“darkness”), relates to the dark side of the family history and the dark side of the city. Along with her careful structuring of the translation, she relates the “darkness” of this image to other images such as Aladdin’s store and the mannequin workshop, a connection that is not readily available in the source text.

“Apartman karanlığı” is first mentioned in the first chapter where the protagonist, Galip, recalls his childhood:

Vasıf sağır ve dilsizdi, ama benim yerlerde sürünürken ‘gizli geçit’ oynadığımı ve yatakların altından geçerek, mağaranın ucuna, *apartman karanlığının dibine ulaşır gibi* ve düşman siperlerine kazdığı bir tünelde kedi sessizliğiyle ilerleyen bir asker gibi ulaştığımı ve kendisiyle alay etmediğimi anlardı (*KK* 13; emphasis mine)

Vasıf was deaf and mute, but he understood that I was only playing “Secret Passage,” and not making fun of him, as I crept on the floor dragging myself under the beds to the end of the cave, *as if to reach the depth of darkness in the apartment building*, like a soldier who proceeds with feline caution in the tunnel he’s dug into the enemy trenches. (BB 5; emphasis mine)

The Turkish “apartman karanlığının dibine ulaşır gibi” literally means “to reach the bottom of the apartment airshaft.” Thus, it indicates the specific location in the building. In the translation, “the depth of darkness” represents the powers of darkness against which Galip, “the brave little soldier,” has to fight. This fantastic and fairy tale layer that Gün created in the translation relates to the rest of Galip’s journey, as well. Later in his life he takes on a similar preoccupation, fighting against the darkness of human nature. Literally, he becomes a lawyer, fighting to defend justice; on a symbolic level, he takes on an existential search, fighting to correct human vice and to realize his potential as a writer. Gün’s interpretation of this image adds to the source text meaning an existential darkness and fear. The reader also finds “armless pink dolls that still batted their plastic eyelashes hopelessly yet stubbornly” that have been thrown into the apartment airshaft (181). It is a place where “one could very well imagine that the whammies and the jinxes, too, seeped in from the dark gap” (182). The dark void and the airshaft in the translation readily connect in an extended metaphor with the dolls and the uncanny mannequins in subsequent chapters. The apartment airshaft is a dark void where these various objects accumulate and stand for the dark nature of the subjects, who own them. Commodity fetishism makes people buy objects they do not need and throw them down the airshaft. It is the space around which people literally live. Its darkness stands for how they relate to one another, their

peculiar habits, failures, bankruptcies, debts, incestuous relationships, infidelities, divorces, jealousy, and eventual death. Thus, by highlighting the symbolic and metaphoric aspects of “apartman karanlığı” as a “dark void,” Gün’s translation allows for an alternative interpretation, one that reveals the dark aspects of the characters.

Gün leaves culture-specific terms as they are in the original and escorts them into the international repertoire of vocabulary. Words such as *raki* and *dolmuş* are examples of this. However, she adopts a different strategy with the word “nazire.” She writes, “Evenings when Jelal carried on for hours about the courtly art of *nazire*, poems modeled after other poems, divulging that it was his only skill” (226). Gün retains the word “nazire” as it is in the original, thereby introducing the reader to a new generic term and explaining the meaning in a parenthetical phrase. As I explained in chapter 2, *Kara Kitap* employs the generic conventions of metafiction, exposing the illusion of fiction and drawing attention to itself as a construct. Identifying metafictional references and how they function in the overall structure and construction of the text allows for appropriate interpretation of the novel. The genre nazire relates to this literary device and appears when *Kara Kitap* comments on itself as a novel modeled after other literary works. The reader comes across the term in chapter 22, “Who Killed Shams of Tebriz,” where Galip is initiated into authorship as he goes through Jelal’s material written over the years. Galip realizes how much Jelal has borrowed from other writers and especially from Rumi, which reminds him of the Ottoman literary genre nazire, of which Rumi’s *Mathnawi* and Şeyh Galip’s *Beauty and Love* are prime examples. While for the source reader this moment in the text implies the reassessment of the Ottoman literary heritage by contemporary writers and serves as an allusion to this disavowed past, for the target reader, it introduces a new literary and generic convention common to Middle Eastern literature.

Gün's translation has often been criticized for employing archaic words. Although it is impossible to label the translation as entirely "archaic" in diction, Gün exploits the possibilities of the English language by using vocabulary that resonates with Latin, Greek, and old German. She does this for reasons and it is necessary to reflect on them before one criticizes or dismisses her translation. Pamuk's *Kara Kitap* offers linguistic innovation in terms of reclaiming and resurrecting some aspects of the Turkish language that have been banned from usage, forgotten, and disavowed. Today, it is possible to use the old and new Turkish language registers, and contemporary writers like Pamuk often make use of this linguistic variety. In Turkey, for a long time, a specific use of language came to represent a specific ideological stance, such as "progressive" if using modern Turkish words and expressions, and "fundamental" if using archaic diction. These two would not mix since that would indicate the mixture of two "incompatible" ideologies. Certainly each of these positions is tainted with a sense of loss and nostalgia. In *Kara Kitap*, Pamuk employs these two different registers side by side for ironic purposes and parody. For instance, he reclaims the Ottoman literary tradition with Arabic and Persian names and expressions such as "Celal," "Galip," "Rüya," and "Şehr-ı Kalp," which fall into the "old" usage. Pamuk employs "hafıza" rather than "anı" for "memory," "mehtap" rather than "ay ışığı" for "moonlight," and expressions resembling the style of Ottoman poetry, such as "Uykunun huzuruna gömülmüş Rüya'nın kapıları kapalı bahçelerinin söğütleri, akasyaları, asmalı gülleri" (KK 11). Pamuk also employs the supposed hallmark of "western" literary tradition, the novel, to acknowledge Arabic, Persian, and other Middle Eastern literary traditions. Gün meets the challenge of translating these aspects of *Kara Kitap* by using unusual constructs, archaic words and expressions, and synonyms that come from Greek, Latin, and old German. This strategy allows her to recreate the "heteroglossia" of the source language and text (Bakhtin

273). Some of these examples are: “to have his discovery penned” (*BB* 363), “to divest himself of” (371), “engaged himself a scribe” (371), “traipsed around” (362), “have the upper hand in the melee” (369), “necktied but slovenly high-school boys” (179), “the thievish ragman” (5).

Another appropriate example here is Gün’s translation of the epigraph of chapter 17, a sentence from an early twentieth-century Turkish writer, Ahmet Haşim, who wrote in old Turkish with words from Arabic and Persian origins. This example illustrates the parallels Gün has found to reveal the “heteroglossic” aspect of *Kara Kitap*: “Whenever I *cast a restorative gaze* on the past, I seem to perceive *a throng perambulating* in the dark” (161; emphasis mine) is Gün’s translation of “Yine şimdi o zamanlara doğru *irca-i nazar* ettikçe karanlıkta *yürüyen bir izdiham* sezinler gibi oluyorum” (*KK* 183; emphasis mine). In this example, Gün could not find an archaic expression for the Persian construct “*irca-i nazar*,” which she renders with “cast a restorative gaze,” but she recovers the loss by opting for the Latinate “perambulating” and the more archaic “throng” (instead of the more common “crowd”) in the same line. The word choice creates a certain flavor that contrasts with the word choice of previous chapters, thus effecting a defamiliarization through a variety of verbal usages. These are some of the expressions picked by book reviewers who made negative comments about the language of the translation based on individual words and expressions, and without considering the reasons for these choices and how they function in relation to other images and elements in the translation.

Gün leaves certain words in Turkish while she calques others. This is especially in relation to means of transportation (“*dolmuş*”) or food or drink items (“*simit*,” “*salep*,” “*helva*,” “*köfte*,” “*lokum*,” “*rakı*”). Her translation consists of diverse strategies, rendering the translation a hybrid text and creating balance between extremes such as “foreignizing,” which leads to alienating, or “domesticating,” which leads to transparency. Gün retains the Turkish word

“dolmuş,” for instance, rather than substituting it with the literal translation of “shared taxi.” “Dolmuş” is a word used daily in Turkish and refers to a specific kind of transportation, carrying cultural resonance, which would have been lost in the expression “shared taxi.” “Dolmuş” is the shared taxi, hundreds of which one sees in Istanbul every day. The word “dolmuş” means “full.” It is the most crowded means of transportation, with vehicles more often than not exceeding the allowed number of passengers and speed limit. It reveals the specific conditions in which Galip reads Celal’s column every day, thus emphasizing Galip’s passion for the column no matter where and how he reads it. Translating it as “shared taxi” does not meet the implications of the original word.

Another such example is the word “lokum,” which Gün leaves as it is rather than substituting the exotic “Turkish delight.” This contradicts Esin Erdim’s argument that Gün has either “exoticized” or “naturalized” certain images in her translation. Gün refuses to supply commonly accepted expressions and reinforce stereotypes perpetuated through these expressions. The meaning of these foreign words becomes clear in the course of the narrative thus rendering any explanation or literal substitution unnecessary. For instance, the first time the word “köfte” is used, it is not clear from the context what kind of food “köfte” is (*BB* 106). This is when Galip has soup and “grilled *köftes*” at a restaurant before he pays a visit to Rüya’s ex-husband, where he hopes to find her. The second time the word comes by is in the chapter of “We Are All Waiting for Him,” where the meaning is clear: “at köfte shops where children are kept kneading hamburger twelve hours a day” (132). By using the word “hamburger” in the same sentence, the meaning of the word “köfte” is revealed. “Rakı” is used with “a bottle of,” which implies that this is an alcoholic drink (40). However, although a very common Turkish food item, like “köfte,” Gün decides to render “simit” as “sesame bagels.” In the chapter entitled “The Kiss,”

Jelal goes to visit a friend of his mother's family and they have "sesame bagels" with tea. This way, through alternating Turkish words and semantic or literal translations, Gün creates a hybrid text and breaks the monotony of using the same strategy consistently, highlighting the foreignness of her text while at the same time accomplishing a bridge between original and translation.

As I have stated earlier, Pamuk's language in this novel is repetitive for various reasons. Chapter 35, "The Story of the Prince" is an apt example of this. Even if he repeats certain words for an effect, that is, to highlight their thematic and intertextual aspects, repetitiveness becomes tedious and distracting. It takes attention away from the subtle thematic discussions. It obviates what could have been suggested merely through allusion and alternative aesthetic strategies. The new Turkish language, with its limited vocabulary and the morphological process of agglutination (adding the affixes to different root words), reduces opportunities for creativity and word play. When compared with the source text, it is clear that Gün relies on what she calls the "cadence of the English language" to make up for the repetitive nature of the source text (quoted in Erdim 218). The chapter "The Story of the Prince" is a relevant example. Here, Galip, impersonating Celal, tells the BBC reporters the story of the prince, who wanted to get rid of all sorts of influences and be only himself. This chapter is full of paragraphs repeating the same verb over and over again. On pages 408 and 409, in a single paragraph Pamuk repeats the word "kendi" ("himself") sixteen times. Other words that repeat many times in a single paragraph are "çünkü" ("because," *KK* 406–7), "onun yüzünden" ("because of him," 415), and "her zaman" ("always," 415). Gün employs various synonyms or omits repetitions in order to ease the original text's repetitiveness: "since... not because...given that... besides... since" (367), "him... rather than himself... myself...this person...identified himself...regarded myself... just myself" (370–

71). Another example of Gün's wealth of vocabulary coming to her aid is when she uses the expressions "Beyoğlu hood," "Beyoğlu mobster," "Beyoğlu thug" (*BB* 55), "our racketeer" (346), "the famous gangster" (348) for Pamuk's multiple repetitions of "Beyoğlu haydut" throughout the novel (*KK* 25). Gün's text avoids repetitiveness while creating a translation that resonates with various languages. She revolts against the monotonous aspects of the new Turkish language, which was purged of cadence and resonance by being "cleansed" of Arabic and Persian words. This is a theme Gün often brings up in her own fiction as I discussed earlier. Her strategy of creating a hybrid text in *The Black Book* and using Greek, Latin, and old German vocabulary distances her translation from mainstream English texts, much to the dismay and expectations of her British critics.

"The Day the Bosphorus Dries Up" is Jelal's first newspaper column in the novel. It is about Jelal's conjured-up vision of what would happen when the waters of the Bosphorus dry up. The column begins as the description of an approaching physical catastrophe, that is, the receding of the waters, and turns into a symbolic vision of various historical confrontations between the east and the west, ending up with a call to a lover at a time of disaster. It is a vision where layer upon layer of signs are revealed in the form of images buried in the bottom of the Bosphorus. Gün adds apocalyptic overtones to her translation. This aspect of the text relates to the religious resonance in the transcription of the name "Jelal" and the recreation of this character as a savior figure. Gün chooses the phrase "apocalyptic chaos" (*BB* 15) for "kıyametimsi kargaşa" ("doomsday confusion," *KK* 24). The apocalypse is a biblical image, while the word "kıyamet" in Turkish has both religious and secular connotations. By opting for this choice, Gün connects the setting, an apocalyptic city, to Jelal as a savior figure. Considered together, this and other images reinforce religious and mythical interpretations of the translation.

In the source text, the city of Istanbul and the dried up Bosphorus are results of natural and moral disasters while these images in the translation acquire mythical and biblical dimensions.

The Turkish title is “Boğazın Suları Çekildiği Zaman” (literally “The Time When the Waters of the Bosphorus Recede”). The tense indicator in Turkish is ambiguous in defining the time of the receding of the waters. The English title, “The Day the Bosphorus Dries Up,” renders it in present tense and bolsters the apocalyptic image. It could have been rendered as “When the Bosphorus Dries Up” or “When the Waters of the Bosphorus Recede” or “The Time When the Bosphorus Dries Up.” “The Day” of the chapter title in the translation stands as a reference to the Day of Judgment. “To dry up” signifies the end of a process, while “to recede” addresses the process itself. The active voice in “waters receding” creates an image of a natural disaster while “dried-up waters” creates a stronger apocalyptic vision. The prophetic tone of this chapter is enhanced by the Latinate vocabulary Gün employs. “Be forewarned about what I know: the catastrophes that happen in this pestilent place quarantined behind barbed wire will affect us all” (*BB* 15) is a good example. Other examples are “galleons will gleam like the luminous teeth of ghosts,” “gurgling sewage,” “lacuna,” “in supplication to,” “carcasses of pointy-prowled galleys,” “dilapidated,” “pestilent place quarantined behind barbed wire,” “noxious darkness,” “den of iniquity,” “pearlized television screen,” “replete with their emblem and their armament,” “permit me entrance.”

Besides the apocalyptic image of the Bosphorus, Gün’s translation adds mythical overtones to the text through her translation of another image, that of statues of Atatürk, the legendary savior of the Turkish people. This is an appropriate decision since the events to which this image alludes took place in the early years of the Republic, which are often rewritten and skirted by revisionist historians. For the majority of the people in Turkey, Atatürk was a savior

who gave birth to a new nation from the remnants of the Ottoman Empire. He was regarded as the political and military leader who founded the Turkish Republic during the early 1920s, and he grew to mythical proportions in the eyes of his people. These mythical proportions are strengthened by various representations in the form of statues or portraits in school classrooms and official buildings across the country. In chapter 30, “Brother Mine,” Gün relies on apocalyptic overtones to turn these statues into representations of a mythical figure. In *Kara Kitap*, Celal envisions the moment when in the middle of the night the statues of Atatürk suddenly come to life and walk down the streets of towns and cities across the country: “Bir mahşer gecesinde, gökyüzünün karanlığı şimşekler ve yıldırımlarla yırtılırken ve yer yerinden oynarken bütün o korkunç Atatürk heykellerinin canlanacaklarını yazmıştın” (KK 343). The reference is to an indefinite time: “bir mahşer gecesinde” could be interpreted as “one/a/any judgment night.” “Mahşer” literally means “great confusion of great crowds of people and the time when the dead are resurrected.” Pamuk opts for a word from the Arabic, “mahşar” (مَحْشَر), which suggests Qur’anic interpretation of the last judgment. Also, the reference is to a “night.” The translation refers to a “day,” which connects it to a biblical interpretation of the Judgment and Redemption: “You’d written that in the day of the apocalypse, when lighting and lightning bolts tore through the dark sky and quakes moved the firmament, all those terrifying Atatürk statues would come to life” (BB 310).

In line with the theme of doubles, the mythical figure of Atatürk is in parallel with Jelal’s, who is another savior in the text. As a newspaper writer whose column readers consult daily to find out various truths related to their days, he is elevated to a savior’s position. He is revered so much that different members of the same family buy the same copy of *Milliyet* at the same time. They read his column so carefully that they memorize what he has written. For instance, in the

chapter “The Three Musketeers,” the three masters of the trade of journalism tell him that he is both the savior and the antichrist in the eyes of his readers. From the family members we learn that, earlier in his life, he was involved in the planning of a coup that would have changed the fate of both Turkey and the entire East. Eventually, Celal is shot dead in the middle of a muddy Istanbul street, presumably by one of his readers, who assumed that Celal has betrayed “their cause.” Gün’s translation allows for an alternative interpretation of the original: one in which the mythical images discussed above come together to suggest that Jelal is a Christ figure who eventually is “crucified” for the sins of the others. When the image of the dried-up Bosphorus, the statues of Atatürk, the character Jelal, the narrative style, tone, and archaic diction are considered all together, mythical and biblical overtones become clear. Thus, the translation has a redemptive element that allows for a positive interpretation of the ending of the novel. The original *Kara Kitap* though, is a rather dark and “black” book.

In this section of chapter 3, I demonstrated how *The Black Book* in Güneli Gün’s translation highlights the intertextual and metatextual aspects of the original *Kara Kitap*, drawing attention to itself as a text, a construct, a rewriting, and translation. Gün opted for vocabulary from Greek, Latin, and old German, exploiting all the possibilities of the English language and substituting repetitions in the original with a variety of synonyms in the translation. She retains certain culture-specific words in Turkish, while she calques others. Her translation strikes a balance between extreme translation strategies, rendering a hybrid text that introduces new cultural and literary concepts (“nazire” “dolmuş” “raki”) into the target literary system. Gün’s translation of specific images such as the Bosphorus, the city, the status of Atatürk, the character Jelal, and various references to disasters, omens, coups, and the end of the world allow for alternative interpretation of the ending. Her text resonates with other literary and religious texts of world

literature thereby performing a bridging role between two literary, religious, and cultural traditions such as the Turkish and the Anglo-American. Her translation allows for “aesthetic appreciation” when hasty judgmental approaches to the translation are dismissed (Turkkan, “Orhan Pamuk’s *Kara Kitap*,” 55). Translation analysis requires reading and reviewing in relation to the specific historical, geographical, and temporal conditions that gave rise to the translation, with specific attention to the translator’s contributions as a creative writer.

Chapter 3: Maureen Freely's *The Black Book* (2006)

And it's the music I love most in Turkish. This comes from my time as an American child in 1960s Istanbul, listening and not understanding, but catching the emotional undercurrents that words can so easily hide. So when I sat down to try my hand at translating Turkish, it seemed I should begin there, with the music. I would start at the heart of the sentence and work my way out, rather than the other way around. The challenge was to reorder the various parts of the sentence in a way that allowed it to unfold and reveal its heart. I was not done until I had managed to order them in a way I felt to be an accurate reflection of the author's original intentions. Because I came, with time, to understand how his long sentences contributed to the narrative stance, I tried, whenever possible, to keep them at their original length. But I also wanted them to be clear—or clear enough.

—Maureen Freely, “Translator's Afterword”

Güneli Gün's translation of *The Black Book*, its negative reception in the *Times Literary Supplement* and in other London publications, Pamuk's Nobel Prize, and the eventual new translation by Maureen Freely present an interesting case study. It raises a multiplicity of questions: although both *The Black Book* and *The New Life* in Gün's translation were harshly criticized, why is it that only *The Black Book* appears in a new translation? Why haven't Pamuk's first two novels, *Cevdet Bey ve Oğulları* and *Sessiz Ev* been translated into English yet? How has Pamuk's image as an international writer evolved and is that supported by the translations since the Nobel Prize? How can we account for the differences between Gün's and Freely's translations, the same story but stylistically very different?

It is significant that in the history of literary translation from Turkish into English, one novel, Orhan Pamuk's *Kara Kitap*, has two translations in English. Gün's translation came out in 1994, before Pamuk was nominated for the Nobel Prize in literature in 2006, and Maureen Freely's translation came after the prize. The Nobel Prize catapulted Pamuk to the stature of an

international writer and increased the general interest in Turkish literature. It marks the shift in Pamuk's position regarding English translations and translators and his evolving image as an international writer. After the Nobel prize, he began to work closely with Freely and to scrutinize the English versions, since he considered the English translations to be more definitive than the originals and the basis for subsequent translations to other languages. This approach by the author throws light on the centrality of the English language in literature, publication, and circulation.

Similar to the reception of Gün's translation, the reception of Freely's *The Black Book* remains on evaluative level without any consistent criteria. Book reviewers continue to address the quality of the translation and make evaluative judgments without having the necessary language skills to read the original text. The most important impact of the new translation is that it draws attention to the translator, to translation as an act of mediation, and to Turkish literature in general. Most reviews of Gün's translation did not mention that they addressed a text in translation and negative reviews only served to marginalize the text and the translator. Reviews of Freely's translation necessarily addressed the text as a "new translation" and acknowledged the translator albeit in problematic ways, which I discuss below.

In this chapter, I focus on Freely's translation and analyze it in the light of the Afterword she wrote. I draw on other texts (her novels, journalistic writing, and interviews) in order to understand her position as a translator and her translational choices. Freely's translation reveals that she opted to create a clear and readable text in English. She accomplished this by restructuring the text, using italics and parentheses where she deemed appropriate, cutting down long sentences and paragraphs, and avoiding transliterations of names. Although this strategy resulted in a clear and seemingly transparent and readable text, it also ended up undoing the

literary ambiguities of the original text. In particular, the image of the city of Istanbul in the new translation stands out. Analyzed carefully and in relation to Freely's other writings, the new translation reveals the translator's nostalgic attitude to the city and its culture in which she grew up. At the same time, the new translation bolsters Pamuk's desired image as "the writer of the city." This also explains why Pamuk, especially after the Nobel Prize, came to be known and referred to as "the writer of the city." I analyze the translation as an individual text, in and of itself. When necessary, I compare it with the original to reveal how Freely's text differs from Pamuk's. Occasionally, I draw comparisons with Gün's translation to reveal that Freely consulted the first translation.

The new translation of *The Black Book* is unique in that in the years between 1882 and 2009, no other Turkish novel has received (or has been seen as deserving) a new translation in English. It is obvious that Pamuk's position as a Nobel laureate plays a significant role in the willingness of the publisher to issue a new translation. However, this is not sufficient to explain why *The Black Book* received a new translation. As I demonstrate below, the centrality of the city of Istanbul in *The Black Book* relates to Pamuk's desire to be known as the writer of the city, which when combined with the negative critique Gün's translation received, gave rise to the new translation.

Re-translation Research and the New Translation of *The Black Book*

Translation studies research often follows the history-as-progress model when accounting for the existence of retranslations. It is widely presumed that subsequent translations will succeed in bringing forth more appropriate, more faithful texts, closer to the original, or texts that will be more suitable to the needs and competence of modern readers. According to the majority of

studies on the subject, new translations appear as time passes and succeed the previous translations in a linear fashion. “Succeed” here implies both “to come after, next and take its/their place” and “to be successful or a better version.” In his well-known essay, “The Measure of Translation Effects,” Philip Lewis, who subscribes to the notion of retranslation as progress, writes: The very possibility of translating strongly derives from that of reading insightfully, and the latter derives in turn from a familiarity that can only be gained over time. The closer a translation of a *monumental text*... is to the original’s date of publication, the more likely it is to be unduly deficient. (Lewis “The Measure” 59-60; emphasis mine)

As the quote above indicates, translation scholars often associate the notion of new translation with “monumental texts,” that is, with canonical literary texts (Berman 1990 2-3; Gambier 1994 415-6; Rodrigues 1990 71-2; Topia 1990 48). This approach inevitably situates the discussion within the notion of “great translations.” New translations come up as a result of the aging of previous translations. According to this view, some translations age quickly while others persist (e.g. Berman 1990; Gambier 1994; Rodriguez 1990). The argument implied in these studies is that new translations come into being because “great translations” are very few. As Berman writes, “In this domain of essential inaccomplishment which characterizes translation, it is only through retranslation that one can –occasionally- attain accomplishment. ...The possibility of an accomplished translation emerges only after the initial blind and hesitant translation” (quoted in Susam-Sarajeva “Multiple-Entry Visa” 2-3).

Discussing new translations based on the idea of linear progress leads to a forked path. It is assumed that new translations either lean towards the source text, its otherness, its adequacy (in the sense Gideon Toury uses the term) or towards contemporary readers’ imagined expectations. The main assumption behind the first approach is that new translations try to

restore something to the “original,” something that is lost in the previous translation. This argument is strong among those scholars who believe that the initial translations are mostly assimilative and reduce the “otherness” of the source text:

The initial translation often leads –has often led- to a naturalization of the foreign text; it tends to reduce the text’s alterity, so that the text can be better integrated into another culture. It frequently resembled –so-called adaptation, in that it does not respect much the textual forms of the original. The initial translation generally aims at acclimatising the foreign text by subjecting it to socio-cultural imperatives which privilege the addressee of the translated text.

... Compared to the introduction-translation, the acclimatizing translation, retranslation is usually more attentive to the letter of the source text, its linguistic and stylistic profile, and its singularity. (quoted in Susam-Sarajeva "Multiple-Entry Visa" 4)

That is, later translations are more efficient in conveying the previously assimilated “otherness” of the foreign material. On the other hand, there are also those who note that some new translations are much closer to being adaptations of the source text, succeeding the initial more literal translations (Rodriguez 77). The goal of these new translations, it is assumed, is to bring the source text closer to the reader of the day. In this case, the time factor is emphasized and the focus is on “translations of the same text which were done in different periods of time” (Du-Nour 328). New translations “bring changes because times have changed” (Gambier quoted in Susam-Sarajeva "Multiple-Entry Visa" 4). Thus, new translations are seen as consequences of a certain kind of “evolution” in the receiving system, and by examining them one can reveal the accompanying evolution of norms governing translations.

In general, new translations foreground the translator's agency. They often claim various distinctions that set them apart from previous translations, asserting, for example, that they have better access to the source text, the source culture, or the author (Hanna, *Towards a Sociology* 208). Some translators discredit previous translations by pointing out various deficiencies in them while others seek distinction by claiming that their translations serve a function in the target culture that has not been served by earlier translations (223). Venuti foregrounds the role of the individual translator and argues that, "retranslations typically highlight the translator's intentionality because they are designed to make an appreciable difference" (Venuti "Retranslations: The Creation of Value" 29). Nevertheless, individual choices are naturally embedded in a larger social context and "transindividual factors inevitably enter into translation projects" (Venuti "Retranslations" 30).

Another important point that needs to be considered in the discussion of new translations is that the issue of retranslation or the idea of a "multiple-entry visa" is a fact of the target literary system (Susam-Sarajeva "Multiple-Entry Visa" 30). It is the target system that determines the ways in which the "visa" would be granted (or not) to the foreign text, under what conditions, for which purposes, and how often. It is necessary to point out here that the concepts of "target literary system" and "one and the same target language" are problematic and need to be contextualized when discussing new translations. As Antony Pym has noted, it may as well be futile to present generalizations regarding retranslations or new translations (83). Case studies located within diverse sociocultural situations yield alternative results, as is my intention to show in this chapter.

Aside from focusing on the new translation of *The Black Book*, this chapter also problematizes the notion of the same target language of new translations. In the case of *The*

Black Book translations into English, one is confronted with two Englishes, British and American. The first one is conservative and rule-governed, and resonates with the attitudes and ideology of a former empire. The second one carries more eclectic and liberating registers that have emerged as a result of historical developments and the tension between the older, conservative British English and various linguistic formations due to waves of immigration. This also applies to how different English readers received the two translations. British reviewers' complaint about Gün's choice of language (idiomatic American) demonstrates the lack of tolerance with "Englishes" other than the British English. American reviewers reading Freely's translation, on the other hand, complain that the formal British English is not fit to render a novel in Turkish, thus revealing their preconceived expectations of what a Turkish novel (in English translation) should be. While Freely's British accent is welcomed by British readers, American readers find her text rigid and less accessible (McGaha 123).

The new translation also problematizes the concept of one source text. As I demonstrate with concrete examples below, often times, Freely consults Gün's translations and occasionally commits the same mistakes as Gün. In this case, the first translation serves as a source text. That a translation serves as the basis for further acts of translation "is no refutation of ... target oriented assumption" (Toury 27). In other words, although a translation in this case acts as a source text, it is still a product of a former target culture now turned into a mediating one, and it is assigned the role of source text not because of anything it may inherently possess but in accordance with the concerns of a new prospective recipient system. Norms governing the "acceptability" (in Toury's sense) of one translation into English do not necessarily govern the second English translation.

Another important factor in the issue of the new translation is the strong presence and scrutiny of the author, Pamuk. The Nobel Prize increased his fame and popularity not only among foreign readers but also among publishers, who welcomed the publication of the new translation. This explains the presence of a new translation of a Turkish novel when publishing a translation of any book written in Turkish is a matter of serious negotiation among publishers, authors, and translators. Publishers make decisions based on profit. Translations of Turkish literature are not favored unless the author is award-winning or a bestseller at home, or unless the publisher caters to an academic audience. Although the new translation cannot be studied outside of such socio-economic and historical contexts, relying on a strictly social-causal model to explain the new translation runs the risk of overlooking the human element, the translator's creative impact (or lack of it), on the final product. Thus, it is crucial to study the new translation not only from a diachronic but also from synchronic perspective. The synchronic approach yields the evolution of norms governing the translations, from the first to the second, and how these norms reflect Pamuk's evolving image as an international writer.

The translation scholar Gideon Toury discusses the impact of translations on the target literary system under the concept "tolerance of interference" (*Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* 278). Several events associated with the name Orhan Pamuk created a welcoming setting and "tolerance of interference" for translations of Pamuk's novels in particular and for literary translations from Turkish, more generally. The International IMPAC Dublin Literary Award, granted to Erdağ Gökner's English translation of *My Name is Red* in 2003 increased Pamuk's fame in the English speaking world. Pamuk's Nobel Prize in 2006 brought him international recognition. Pamuk was charged with insulting "Turkishness"⁴¹ in 2005 under the Article 301 of the Turkish penal code, which was condemned abroad and created solidarity

⁴¹ For a detailed discussion of Pamuk trials see McGaha.

among other international writers for Pamuk. Lately, there has been a positive development in the European Union's openness to Turkey's accession. Especially when translation takes place across clear power differentials, it is important to consider the relative prestige of cultures and languages, as they are seen from the vantage point of the prospective target system. "Tolerance of interference" tends to increase when translation is carried out from a 'major' or highly prestigious language or culture into a 'minor' or 'weak' one. Certainly, designations such as 'majority' and 'minority,' 'strength' and 'weakness' are relative rather than fixed and not inherent features of languages and cultures. This approach partially helps to explain why Gün's translation was met with resistance while Freely's translation was welcomed, even though it is the same author, Orhan Pamuk, and the same novel, *Kara Kitap*, that are under consideration.

Gideon Toury emphasizes the importance of the study of norms for the purposes of research in translation studies. He argues that what is available for the researcher's observation is "norm-governed instances of behaviour" (*Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* 65). Whereas adherence to source norms determines translation's adequacy as compared to the source text, subscription to norms originating in the target culture determines its acceptability (57). Through analyzing normative translational behavior, I attempt to situate the translation between the two extremes of Toury's "adequate translation," which leans towards the source texts and "acceptable translation," which leans towards the norms of the target literary system. As Toury points out, the study of norms constitutes a vital step towards establishing how "the functional-relational postulate of equivalence ... has been realized" (61). In order to contextualize the translation and the process of translating, I compare the nature of translational norms to those governing non-translational kinds of text production. In this chapter, I account for textual norms by focusing on specific instances from Freely's translation that are characteristic of the norms

that govern her translation. As for the extratextual norms (norms governing non-translational text production), I demonstrate how examples from Freely's novels, journalistic writing, and interviews she gave reveal her nostalgia related to the city of Istanbul, where she spent her childhood, and how this relates to the ways she writes and translates. Her nostalgia about the city of Istanbul explains why she placed a particular emphasis on that imagery in her translation of *The Black Book*. This relates to Pamuk's image as an international writer and maintains his badge as the "writer of the city."

There is a fundamental difference between textual and extra-textual sources that surround the case study of Freely's translation. The translation itself is a product of norm-regulated behavior and can be taken as the immediate representations of these norms. Normative pronouncements (Freely's *Afterward* to the translation, essays she has written about the translation, her fiction), by contrast, are by-products of the textual norms. They are often partial and subjective. This demonstrates that there are gaps and even contradictions, between her explicit statements about the translation, on the one hand, and actual behavior and its results, on the other. With respect to the translator herself, motivations do not necessarily agree with her declaration of intent (which is often put down *post factum*); and the way those intentions are realized may well constitute a further, third category of study.

Freely's translation presents itself as a case study for the delineation of a life story, or a topo-biographical study. When compared with the original text and with the earlier translation, the new translation reveals specific information about the translator and her agenda as a writer. This relates to my overall argument that one has to consider the translators' creative contribution to the proliferation of images of Turkish literature and culture, and in the formation of Pamuk's image as an international writer. More specifically, Freely's translation reveals signs and

metaphors of nostalgia inserted into the text. Translation as a concept, figurative and real, reflects Freely's experience growing and traveling outside the United States in the early 1980s. Here I chart the trajectory of how Freely's powerful sense of "being there," "being in-between," and "having been there" impacts the way she translates Pamuk's novel. In addition, as Pamuk's "authoritative translator" (McLemee) and the translator of his late novels *Snow* (2005) and *Museum of Innocence* (2009), his memoir *Istanbul* (2004), and his essay collection *Other Colors* (2007), Freely tones down Pamuk's exuberance in *Kara Kitap* and simplifies the style to make it more compatible with the tone Pamuk adopted in his later novels. This attitude strongly contributes to Pamuk's consolidation of his late image as the writer of a specific theme (the city) and style (clear and straightforward).

Pamuk's increasing attention to his image and to the representation of the city in his books is more than a coincidence or an arbitrary choice. It helps explain what aspects of the writer and his *oeuvre* bolstered his prestige as an international and cosmopolitan writer. In his study of national languages of developing nations, Ferguson writes that languages of "minor" cultures at some point of their history are regarded by their own native speakers as "backward" and "inadequate" and believed to require "modernizing" among other aspects (Ferguson 27). In an effort towards language, literature, and culture modernization, the ultimate criterion is to bring the allegedly "backward" nation to a stage of "translatability" among the "modern" nations of the world. Ferguson writes, "The modernization of a language may be thought of as the process of its becoming the equal of other developed languages as medium of communication; it is in a sense the process of joining the world community of increasingly intertranslatable languages recognized as appropriate vehicles of modern forms of discourse" (32). However, languages do not become "intertranslatable" in a two-way relationship. "Weaker" languages and literatures are

expected to “achieve” one-to-one correspondence with “stronger” ones. Translatability, then, is sought by the former. In line with this, one image that translates well into English in Pamuk’s novels is the city image, the metropolitan, which has many correspondences in the west. This image connects Pamuk with other international writers such as James Joyce, who capitalizes on the city of Dublin, or the modern *flâneur* Baudelaire and his depiction of Paris. As one scholar, Sibel Irzik, has pointed out, being a novelist of Istanbul also involves making it readable for the globalized culture of the west (in Moretti 735). Beginning with *The White Castle*, his third novel and the first to be translated into English, Pamuk increasingly tapped on themes (issues of identity) and writing techniques (postmodernist literary tricks, puns, allusions), which have been practiced by established “world” writers. This strategy of emulating world authors culminates in his focus on the city imagery in his writings. This approach also explains why his first two novels, *Cevdet Bey ve Oğulları* (an extremely long family saga written in modernist style) and *Sessiz Ev* (Pamuk’s first experiment with unreliable narrative technique), his two most “Turkish” novels, have not been translated into English yet while one novel, *The Black Book*, enjoys two English translations. Simply put, his first two novels do not fit into his desired image as a writer of specific style and preoccupation of writing.

This leads one to reconsider the implications of cultural comparison in literary and cultural studies. The implication is that one relies on a conceptual model derived from the bilingual dictionary –that is, a word or genre in one language (often the “weaker” one) must equal to a word or genre in another (often the “stronger” one), otherwise one of the languages is considered lacking. This is how “stronger” literatures form opinions about other literatures and determine the philosophical grounds for discussion of other cultures. This “trope of equivalence” is established in processes of translation and fixed by means of modern bilingual dictionaries

(Lui 7-8). Thus, definitions of meaning and culture are contingent on the politics of translingual practice. Once such lineage is established, the culture becomes “translatable” and the writer an international one.

Without having access to the original text, book reviewers criticized Gün’s translation based on what they assumed to be “appropriate” linguistic and stylistic choices for a novel written by Pamuk and translated from Turkish into English. As I argued in the previous chapter, reviewers failed to consider a very important factor, the translator’s agenda as a mediator between languages and cultures of unequal historical development. Pamuk’s primary goal in commissioning a new translation in English was to achieve a “readable” target text, which would subsequently be used as a basis for translations into other languages. The new translator and translation aimed to “update” and “correct” the existing translation. Nevertheless, the new translation does not go beyond being just another version in English. More important than that, the new translation reveals a by-product, a residue, which finds explanation in Freely as a translator and a literary and creative agent.

Pamuk’s Image as “the Writer of the City”

Beginning with his essay collection *Other Colors* (2007; *Öteki Renkler: Seçme Yazılar ve Bir Hikaye*, 1999) and culminating in his memoir *Istanbul: Memories and the City* (2004; *İstanbul: Hatıralar ve Şehir*, 2003) and the Nobel Prize speech *My Father’s Suitcase* (*Babamın Bavulu* 2006), Pamuk increasingly identified himself and was referenced in the media as the writer of “the city.” In *Other Colors*, he writes:

I would say that what I did in *The Black Book* was to find a narrative texture to match the force, colors, and chaos of life in Istanbul. The winding sentences of the book, those

vertiginous baroque sentences that spin on their axes, appear to me as arising from the history and chaos of the city and its present riches, irresolutions, and energy. *The Black Book* was written with the motivation to say everything about Istanbul at once, and the book tries to say a lot of things at once. The book also aspires to make *The Thousand and One Nights* come alive in Istanbul. (294–95)

Pamuk's international fame rests on his repetitious examination of Istanbul as a poetic archive. In his novels, he has written and rewritten the stories and histories of the city, mapping its psychic geography and decoding its signifying system. The Swedish Academy, which awarded the 2006 Nobel Prize in Literature to Pamuk, cited him as a writer who in the quest for the melancholic soul of his native city had found symbols for the clash and interweaving of cultures. Pamuk sees himself as the Istanbul novelist who has seen the city in its full depth, through its history and geography, and panoptically through its soul, its materiality, and its illimitability (*Öteki Renkler* [*Other Colors*] 294–95). As Azade Seyhan put it, he represents the city “simultaneously and alternately in episodic, epic, and encyclopedic form and as part biography and part autobiography” (149). He views *The Black Book* as a personal encyclopedia of Istanbul and as a history of many personal memories of the city. In his essay collection, *Other Colors*, he writes, “In *The Black Book*, I finally did something I’ve been wanting to do for years, a sort of collage, bits of history, bits of future, the present, stories that seem unrelated... To juxtapose [all these] is a good way of signifying a meaning that should [only] be intimidated, indirectly alluded to” (139). That is, Pamuk's Istanbul is not the representation of the real city and not a text of verifiable reality. Rather, it is a stage of lived history, where the past is the projection of the present viewed in retrospect. This is one definition of memory, as memory is rarely about the

past but instead about how the past is remembered or reconstructed in and for the present. This reconstruction always entails a measure of lack or loss.

It is possible to view the cover of the novel and those of the translations as another form of translation. The original *Kara Kitap*'s cover as issued by İletişim Yayınları represents the theme of identity in the novel. Pamuk interrogates the human desire to emulate the other and the question of being oneself versus being someone else on individual level through the character Galip and on national level through Turkey's problematic relationship with the West. In line with this, the cover of the original features mannequins, various photographs and faces with erased or modified features. As I discussed in Chapter 1, the cover of Gün's translation issued by Farrar, Strauss, and Girox is predominantly red, alluding to the Turkish national flag and implying national and cultural specificity. The contrast between the blackness of the title *The Black Book* and the bright red color of the cover is striking. It also follows on the theme of identity by featuring a male figure –most probably Jelal- with a black face and erased features, holding a mask before his face. All five editions of the new translation issued by Vintage International (a division of Random House, the world's largest English-language book publisher) for Freely's translation feature the city of Istanbul on their covers. This visual translation emphasizes the place of the city in the novel. This aspect of the later translation supports my argument that Pamuk intended to build on the already established image for himself, "the author of the city." A closer look at the new translation reveals how a writer, his image, and the literature and culture he represents signify in the contemporary "global" world and in national and international book markets.

The Translator's Agency: Maureen Freely as a Writer and Translator

Drawing our attention to the close relationship between space and subjectivity, J.M. Malpas writes,

Place is ... that within and with respect to which subjectivity is itself established... place is not found *on* subjectivity but is rather that *on which* subjectivity is founded. Thus one does not first have a subject that apprehends certain features of the world in terms of the idea of place; instead, the structure of subjectivity is given in and through the structure of place. (*Place and Experience: A Philosophical Topography* 35, emphasis in the original)

Locality, spatiality, and situated embodiment have re-emerged as preoccupations in recent philosophical thought, which argues that the structure of subjectivity is predicated on the structure of place rather than vice versa. In particular, this kind of reading inscribes the human subject with the reality of its physical environment, which in turn, marks the text produced by this subject with that experience and culture at a deep level. Predicating the structure of the subject upon its spatial situatedness has significant implications for the structure of the subject's creative work. In line with this, in this section, I demonstrate how Maureen Freely's experience of growing up in Istanbul, living in a culture and language that "were always denied to" her, and identifying the specificities of the place, relates to how she writes and translates (personal interview).

Freely's "Afterword" to the translation is the most significant extra-textual normative statement the translator makes about the translation. In it, Freely discusses the structure of the Turkish syntax and the "music" she hears in the language. She indicates how her translation is different from the previous one and states that she worked closely with the translator on the drafts. The afterword is Freely's argument as to why *The Black Book* deserves a new translation. The most significant aspect of the translator's afterward is that it is heavily marked by her

nostalgia about the setting of the novel, the city of Istanbul, and her overall melancholia.

Nostalgia (from *nostos*, meaning “to return home” and *algia*, meaning “longing”) is longing for home that no longer exists or has never existed (*OED*). It is a sentiment of loss and displacement, but it is also a “romance” with one’s own fantasy (Boym xiii). The word “nostalgia” does not appear in the Index of Freud’s *Standard Collected Works* although Freud comes close to discussing the concept when he analyzes the work of grief in his essay “Mourning and Melancholia.” In this essay, Freud writes that melancholia develops in a form of grief for a lost object or for a loss of any kind, a situation in which “one cannot see clearly what has been lost” and which Freud relates to “an unconscious loss” (166). That is, in melancholia the loss is of an ideal kind. Although like Freud he never uses the word “nostalgia,” Goethe offers a connection between the two concepts: nostalgia is “reviv[ing] an innocent past with sweet melancholy” (quoted in Santesso *A Careful Longing* 13; Goethe 402). In her book *The Future of Nostalgia*, Svetlana Boym offers a useful distinction between the two concepts. While melancholia confines itself to the planes of individual consciousness, nostalgia is about the relationship between individual biography and that of a group or nations, between personal and collective (xvi).

What interests me in Freely’s nostalgia is not the impossibility of reviving a home, real or imaginary but the sentiment itself, the melancholy, and its stylization. In other words, I use the term “nostalgia” to point to Freely’s specific situation with regards to the city of Istanbul and how her idealization and recollection of the place explains the translation and represents her response to the present. Nostalgia, creative and stylized, is an artistic device and a strategy of survival, a way of making sense of the impossibility of going back. The physical space of the city, its changing façade, modernization and the changes it brought, the city’s historical heritage, all within global and international context embody remnants of nostalgia for Freely. The recent

reinvention of urban identity suggests an alternative to the opposition between the local and global cultures and offers a new kind of regionalism: local internationalism. More particularly, especially after Pamuk's trials (during which Freely walked side by side with him in court corridors, acting like his literary agent), the city of Istanbul for Freely gains an alternative meaning and acquires a more somber self-reflective attitude. Translating *The Black Book* gave Freely an opportunity to revisit an imagined homeland. Similarly, in *Enlightenment*, the novel she wrote after translating *The Black Book*, Freely develops an aesthetic of "having been there" and longing for a distant home. She cherishes Istanbul's distance but does not consider going back there. She remains attached to where she is now, which allows her to reimagine and aestheticize the city from afar.

Freely lived in Istanbul during the 1960s, and this time and place is the object of her nostalgic attachment. In *The Black Book*, the city is not only the setting where the plot takes place but also a metaphor and symbol for the nation and its complex history. It is not a surprise that Freely identifies the city as that which made her work of translating the novel conducive and amicable (personal interview). She identifies with the setting and points to her familiarity with the place, albeit in nostalgic terms:

We all used Omo detergent, İpana toothpaste, Job shaving cream, and Sana margarine. I remember a man on a donkey delivering milk straight from the farm. Another man with a horse-drawn cart delivered water. We bought glassware from Paşabahçe, Turkey's only glassmaker. Our shoes came from the dozen or so shops lining *İstiklal Caddesi*, and our silk scarves from Vakko, Turkey's only department store. (Afterword in *The Black Book* 465, emphasis mine)

Freely's decision to reflect on her past experience of living there and then directly connects to how she translates the imagery related to the city. As I reveal in more detail below, Freely's nostalgic attachment to the place results in her refusal to translate even the most easily translatable words such as "Caddesi." "Cadde" means "Avenue" and "İstiklal Caddesi" translates simply as "İstiklal Avenue" or "Liberty Avenue." However, Freely consistently refuses to translate or transliterate, which is partly the result of her emotional attachment to the Turkish language, to the place where she grew up, and to the most prominent avenue of the city of Istanbul. However, the Turkish phrase, "İstiklal Caddesi" in the translation renders the text exotic and performs an alienating function. It does not allow the English reader to identify with the setting, performing distancing and defamiliarization. Furthermore, in the afterword, Freely comments that "at 8:15 there was a forty-five minute light Western music" request program that was, for most of us, the only time we got to hear the Beatles" (465). This comment relates to Freely's general melancholia that is associated with displaced subjects. When she is away from Istanbul, the city is the object of her nostalgia and when she is in Istanbul, she looks for "western" objects from which she is far away.

Freely's nostalgic attitude to the setting of the novel relates to her desire to give it a specific form, order, and clarity, which the original *Kara Kitap*'s ambiguity denies. Quoting the poet Murat Nemet-Nejat, she describes Turkish as "a language that can evoke a thought unfolding" and attempts to explain how she tried to do the same in English without letting the thought vanish. As she points out in the epigraph to this chapter, she identifies "the sentence's 'inner logic'" and "the music" of the Turkish language as her two priorities when she translates. Freely writes that her translation was approved by the author Pamuk, who worked closely with Freely and supervised her translations. However, a comparison between the original text and

Freely's translation reveals that the author's supervision served other means than "faithfulness" to the original. Working together with the translator on the text gave the author opportunity to revisit his writings and give them a new structure in line with his late image. Regardless of what "the author's supervision of the translation" signifies, the text itself reveals an imagery and structure different from that of the original and the first translation. In the original *Kara Kitap*, Pamuk is at his most flamboyantly baroque style. The Turkish novel is a dense and ambiguous text, revealing its writer's ambition through multiplicity of allusions and references to other writers and texts. Gün's translation recontextualizes the novel, allowing for a Judeo-Christian interpretation. She focuses on those aspects of the novel that translate into English at the expense of silencing culture- and history-specific details. Freely's translation, on the other hand, draws attention to the city of Istanbul and puts strong emphasis on the setting and its metropolitan aspects.

A new translation and an afterward written by the new translator call attention to the "problems" with the previous translation, and how the new text sets itself apart from the previous one. About Gün's translation Freely writes: "The translation, though ebullient and faithful to the original, was also somewhat opaque. My hope is that this new translation might bring the book to a generation of readers who know Orhan Pamuk only from his later works. For *The Black Book* is the cauldron from which they come" (464-5). This short statement hints on the different norms governing the two translations. Indeed, Gün's translation, in line with her style as a creative writer, is energetic and lively, crossing multiple registers. Her choice of English words with Greek, Latin, and German roots have a defamiliarizing effect for readers used to standard syntax and vocabulary. This aspect of the translation makes it faithful to the original because the original Turkish text is also a dense and thick text, which makes it a demanding task to read even

for a native Turkish reader. Freely's goal was to elucidate the text and make it more accessible to readers who know Pamuk from his late novels, which were also translated by Freely. Thus, the aim to consolidate the style and the image of the author is clearly stated. However, regardless of the author's approval of the new translation, the original *Kara Kitap* is an opaque text; it is a mistake to make it transparent.

Another important difference between Freely and Gün as translators is how they identify with Pamuk as a writer and how they relate to the style and preoccupation of his writings. In her essay "The Turks are Coming," which appeared in *World Literature Today* in 1992, Gün reviewed *Kara Kitap* for American readers even before the translation was available. She writes, "No other book had spoken to me so completely, hitting my concerns on the head, grabbing the themes I myself pursued, beating me to the punch line" (1992). As I pointed out in Chapter Two when I discussed Gün's role as a translator, she identifies with Pamuk as a writer ("Something Wrong"). She opted for the translation of those of his novels, *The Black Book* and *The New Life*,⁴²—that deal with the same subject matter and themes as Gün's fiction does. Both Pamuk and Gün write in postmodern style, juxtaposing "high" and "low" languages, showing off literary knowledge through linguistic and philosophical tricks, and bringing up Ottoman theme to western readers' attention. Both of them indulge in anachronisms, ransacking in the history treasury that is concealed under the debris of Sufi mysticism and the old Ottoman Empire. Freely, on the other hand, identifies with Pamuk because he is roughly the same age as she is (personal interview) and because both of them went to the same college, Robert College in Istanbul, at the same time, although they did not know each other at that time. Freely indicated that the most appealing aspect of *Kara Kitap* to her was "the city, in which I grew up and know

⁴² She wanted to translate Pamuk's subsequent novel, *My Name is Red*, but Pamuk turned her down.

only so well” (personal interview). It is no surprise that her novels *The Life of the Party* (1986) and *Enlightenment* (2008) are both set in Istanbul.

In general, translations are studied purely based on textual comparison although literary translation is inconceivable without the agent of translation, the translator. However important linguistics, text-linguistics, contrastive textology, or pragmatics and their explanations with respect to translational phenomena are, being a translator cannot be reduced to mere generations of textual utterance, which these disciplines call translation. Rather, translators are creative rewriters and agents with particular agendas.

Born in 1952, Maureen Freely is a U.S. journalist, novelist, translator, and teacher. Although she was born in Neptune, New Jersey, she grew up in Turkey and now lives in England, where she lectures at the University of Warwick and is an occasional contributor to *The Guardian* and *The Independent* newspapers. Among her novels, *The Life of the Party* and *Enlightenment*, are set in Turkey and engage with the politics of the modern state of Turkey. She has also written *The Other Rebecca*, a contemporary version of Daphne du Maurier's classic novel *Rebecca*. Freely is an occasional contributor to *Cornucopia*, a magazine about Turkey. She became prominent as the English translator of Orhan Pamuk's recent novels. She works closely with Pamuk on these translations, because they often serve as the source when his work is translated into other languages.

Freely often refers to her experience growing up in Turkey in relation to the Turkish language: “I remember what it was like the day we arrived –just to be surrounded by another language” (quoted in Glossop 108). Because of the extended travels of her family, she tried her hand at Greek, French, German, Spanish, and Arabic. When she speaks about Turkish, she expresses resentment about learning the language. In Turkey, she was surrounded by people who

spoke English, thus it took her a long time to learn the language: “You could go a long way without speaking much Turkish ... Learning Turkish was like being in disguise” (108). As she confided in me, “I always felt as if Turkish was guarded” (personal interview). Reflecting on her experience in Turkey, she writes:

I was eight years old when my family moved to Istanbul... but because we did not originally plan to stay more than a few years, no one made much of an effort to teach us children Turkish. ... I came to know Turkish as a child comes to know her mother tongue –by listening in on the conversations swirling around me. I came to understand their emotional undercurrents long before I began to grasp their surface meanings. When at last I was able to converse in Turkish, I felt as if I had been admitted to a secret society.

(“Thoughts on Translation”)

Although she studied the major European languages like French, German, and Spanish as part of her education in comparative literature at Harvard, she learned Turkish, Greek, and Arabic on the street, through, as she puts it, “the organic learning method,” listening and interacting with natives, informally. Freely’s nostalgia is related to the fact that after having lived through such a diverse experience, geographically and linguistically, now she lives in Bath, U.K., and has been there for twenty years. Talking about her present, her biggest regret is how monolingual her life has become: “As I’ve ended up in an English-speaking country with children who don’t learn foreign languages in primary school, and had husbands and partners who really only speak one language, my adulthood has been monolingual in a way I never could have predicted. I’m not happy about it” (quoted in Glossop 110).

In “A Translator’s Tale,” Freely comments on her experience translating Pamuk’s fiction in general and *The Black Book* in particular. Her discussion on translation is focused on the level

of language and on the “chasm” between the English and Turkish languages. She writes that to understand a translation one must also “find the moment at the heart of the story where all distance disappears,” thus implying that translation can bridge the “chasm.” In this essay, Freely reflects on the Turkish language, its grammatical structure, and its syntactical peculiarities, “such as the verb coming at the end of a long sentence and retaining the ‘mystery’ till the end” as opposed to the English verb revealing it very early. She is fascinated with the “voice and tense games” the sentence structure allows and which she “admired at length like pictures in a museum.” She adds that if one decides to translate literally from a Turkish prose into English “It was not just the meaning that was muffled, but the music.” In order to avoid what is most valuable according to her in Pamuk’s prose, she decides to prioritize “music” and “clarity.” She comments on earlier translations and indicates what makes her translation different:

In some of Pamuk's earlier English translations, the narrating Orhans lost their power to sing, thereby compromising their power to enchant. Other aspects of the novels --the ideas, the characters, the ingenious and double-jointed structures-- were enough to draw many readers. Nevertheless, I would, I thought, reflect the spirit of the original only if, having ordered the words and linked the clauses in ways that made their meaning clear, I played them "by ear." I was never satisfied, I said, until I could look at the English sentence and hear the Turkish music inside. (“A Translator’s Tale”)

Freely’s comments on the Turkish language and her explanations regarding her translational strategies and priorities indicate that her preoccupation with Turkish was on the linguistic and grammatical level. In her essay “Thoughts on Translation,” she points to the “very great distance between Turkish and English.” She is concerned with how to render the meaning without losing the musicality of the sentence. Her nostalgia regarding her childhood in Turkey plays a

significant role in these statements. As she says, “music was central to my experience of Turkish --for I had learned the language as a child, listening to it swirl around me, reading the emotions long before I understood the words in which they traveled” (“A Translator’s Tale”). She indicates that she consulted the author Pamuk when necessary and got his permission. The fact that Pamuk authorized Freely’s version indicates that he was in favor of a clear and musical prose for the new translation as well since it was those aspects of his late novels that helped him gain popularity abroad. The process of supervising Freely’s translation turned into a process of rewriting, editing, and improving for the author.

Freely worked not only as the English translator of Pamuk’s novels but also, through her journalistic writing, she helped him voice his concerns about the freedom of speech in Turkey. In her interview with the author “Conversation with Pamuk,” she reflects on the situation that gave rise to Pamuk’s being put on trial for “publicly denigrating Turkishness.” She paints an insightful picture of the situation “inside Turkey” and “outside” and relates Pamuk’s drama at home with Turkey’s accession to the EU. It is not surprising that she inserts nostalgic recollection in the middle of the text: “... the Istanbul that Pamuk describes in his books is the lost city of our youth. ... The haze from the Bosphorus gave it the dreamlike beauty of my memories” (Freely “Conversations”). In the same interview, she makes reference to *The Black Book*, which she was translating at that time: “Despite the darkness of the plot and its ominous echoes, I’d found great comfort in *The Black Book*. Much of it takes place in the streets of old Istanbul; I’d walked these streets myself as a child with my father, when he was writing the first guide to the city.” (“Conversations”). When Pamuk offers her the traditional Turkish drink, *boza*, she comments, “It was smooth and thick and nutty, with a slight kick to it- familiar enough to make me wonder if I’d tasted (and forgotten) it as a child.”

Freely reveals a significant shift in how she conceptualizes her role as a translator after Pamuk's trials in Turkey. In her paper "Misreading Orhan Pamuk," which she presented in November 2008, she defines the role of the translator more broadly, reflecting on it in relation to power differentials that accompany languages, literatures, and politics giving them shape. Reflecting on "the political dilemmas of translation as Turkish letters enter the global age," she discusses what it means for Pamuk to be a cosmopolitan writer at home in Turkey and abroad, and how Freely's role as a translator has changed in relation to that:

A translator did not just need to find the right words, stay in conversation with the author, and run interference for him as the book made its way through the publication process. She also had to contextualize the book for readers who were not familiar with Turkey – not inside the text but outside it, in journals and newspapers, at conferences, symposia, literature festivals." ("Misreading")

After Pamuk's trials in Turkey for "insulting Turkishness"⁴³ and as he was more and more alienated by his fellow countrymen for winning the Nobel Prize for Literature in 2006,⁴⁴ Freely came to reflect on the role of the translator in broader terms:

I was attending trials, walking through funnels of riot police, and coming face to face with deep state thugs, and wherever I happened to be in the world, a day rarely went by without a very strange person crossing the room with a boxy smile to offer me a very strange calling card. So once again I expanded my understanding of a translator's job. It was not enough to find the right words, and defend them, and work on the literary peripheries to provide some sort of context, and fight to protect the author as he was

⁴³ In an interview with a Swiss journalist, Pamuk talked about the millions of Armenian citizens whom he knew to have died "in these lands."

⁴⁴ The ultra-nationalists in Turkey believe that Pamuk is a traitor, sold his country to Europe for his career, and the Nobel Prize testifies to that.

attacked on all sides in the name of 1,001 political agendas –I also had to fight for room to breathe– not just for the writers and translators of fiction, but for literature itself.

(“Misreading”)

Freely’s experience reveals that not only is translation never neutral but also it is politically-charged at every stage. Being so intimately related with the writer on the local and global stages Freely experiences what Turkish writers are up against as they enter the global age. They have to fight at two fronts, one at home against nationalist anxieties and myths and one abroad against narrow minded understandings of “that part of the world and its literature” (“Misreading”).

Translators have to perform not only the translation job but also to deal with the more nuanced understanding of the ways in which they are misrepresented and the words of fiction misread.

Freely’s concluding words at the MESA conference read as the preface to her subsequent novel, *Enlightenment*: “Those of us who translate into English have a privileged view of western prejudice as it plays itself out in literary culture. We also see what results from it. You might say that it is not the job for a translator to challenge these practices. But I am not in any doubt that it’s my duty as a writer” (“Misreading”).

Reviews of the New Translation

There is a huge difference between reviews of Gün’s translation and those of Freely’s. This is interesting when both translations are of good quality and render the plot of the original faithfully. The difference between the two translations becomes apparent when one considers closely the translators’ idiosyncratic styles, word choice, and what readers call “the readability” of the translation. The most significant difference between the reviews is that the new translation calls attention to the fact of translation and to the translator. The afterword written by Freely for

the new version plays a significant role in this. The fact of “newness” is associated with better quality especially by those reviewers who don’t have the linguistic skills to compare the new translation and the original work. British reviewers and anonymous reviews on amazon.co.uk lavish praise on the late version and its clarity. In addition, almost uniformly, reviewers discuss the imagery of the city of Istanbul as the most significant aspect of the novel. They demonstrate satisfaction with and understanding of the otherwise thick and dense text that *The Black Book* is. When compared with reviews of Gün’s translation, these reviews address the text as Turkish and treat it as a guide to the city of Istanbul. Reviewers reading Gün’s translation were consistent in comparing Pamuk to writers such as Calvino, Borges, Márquez, and Joyce. None of the late reviews draws such comparison. This aspect of the reviews demonstrates that what sells and attracts attention in the west is the “Turkishness” of the text and the exotic signs the city carries for the western reader.

Reviewing the translation for the British paper *The Observer*, Jonathan Beckman hails Freely’s English as “the international language.” Michael Greenstein, who reviews the novel for the Canadian *National Post*, writes that Freely’s “meticulous translation captures the Byzantine musicality of Pamuk’s prose” (“A Dream Within A Dream; Istanbul’s Reality, Fantasy”). A reader and reviewer on amazon.co.uk, Jonathan Birch writes, “the quality of the new translation is incredible. Much of this fascinating book is a joy to read, and much of the prose is as good as any I’ve read in English in a long time.” Another reader on the same web page comments on “Maureen Freely’s beautiful new translation.” Pamuk’s Australian publisher, Allen & Unwin hails the new translation on their webpage as “Pamuk’s hugely acclaimed novel, published in a stunning new translation by Maureen Freely” while David Eggleton, writing for New Zealand *Listener* calls it “a more sophisticated translation.” Scott McLemee condemns the first translation

and praises Freely's version: "The earlier rendition, published in 1994, suffered from an archness of diction and uncertainty of tone that never let you forget it was a translation. It appears that Pamuk has now found his authorized and definitive translator in Maureen Freely" ("*The Black Book*")

For all of these reviewers, the city of Istanbul is the center of attention in the book. Beckman discusses the city as the first thing in his review: "the Istanbul of this novel constantly threatens to consume Galip, physically and morally, in his wanderings" and "This book may be a love song to Istanbul" ("*The Black Book*"). The title of Greenstein's review pays homage to the city and it is the first thing to call attention to it in his review: "Istanbul ranks high among the most interesting cities in the world ... Orhan Pamuk puts Istanbul on the map ... Only if we know that her name means 'dream' do we become aware that *The Black Book* is a dream within a dream in which Istanbul is both realized and fantasized ... A picaresque tour of Istanbul ... all of these and other too numerous to mention, add up to Istanbul's labyrinth" ("A dream within a dream"). An anonymous reader on amazon.co.uk sees Istanbul personified as a character, who "roughly follows Galip in his search." Allen and Unwin devote three out of five lines of the blurb to the city of Istanbul: "a labyrinthine novel suffused with the sights, sounds, and scents of Istanbul, an unforgettable evocation of the city where East meets West." David Eggleton, writing for New Zealand *Listener*, finds the title "Hidden city" fit for his review and comments, "Orhan Pamuk's novel about Istanbul is a book to burrow into, to get lost in –much like the legendary city itself ... In *The Black Book*, Istanbul is "the black book": that is, a text, a book of signs to be studied, a great palimpsest made up of layer after layer of history ... *The Black Book* is a fable, an insider's guide to Istanbul. ... it's his ability to dig deep into the essential energies of his own city, to dig down to its treasure hoard gleam, that saves him from being a pale imitation." In one

short review, a full first paragraph is devoted to the “rhapsodic celebration of the ancient metropolis.” Philip Spires, who sees the translation as an opportunity for Pamuk to widen his readership in the English-speaking world, writes about the place of the city in this translation. He comments, “We feel we are in the city. We feel we are living its history, whatever that might be. And we feel we are experiencing contemporary debates on it and its people’s identity. The city is central to everything in the book, with its multiple histories and allegiances mixed into the melting pot of its contemporary form ... the characters become the city, whose sense of place and multiplicity of identities pervade all, thus mirroring the apparent confusion of its –and humanity’s– complexity. But the people eventually are always welcomed by some aspect of the city’s –and humanity’s–multi-faceted nature” (“A Review”).

While reviews of Gün’s translation express confusion as to what the novel is about, about the ambiguous aspects of the plot and the enigma of the book, reviews of Freely’s translation reveal substantial understanding of the subtleties of the novel. Beckman comments that although it is a long novel and full of seemingly irrelevant stories, “it becomes apparent that the events are related” (“Paperback of the week”). Greenstein discusses one of the most difficult to identify aspects of the original novel, the point of view, and calls the narrator, “at once omniscient and ignorant” (“A dream within a dream”). Pamuk’s novel had been criticized for being as a forest with too many trees where the attention to individual trees prevents the reader from grasping the whole picture. Greenstein is more positive about the final “point”: “the novel dwells on so many other matters that the reader loses sight of the plot. At what point does one enter Istanbul’s labyrinth and when does one emerge from its intricacies? If Pamuk’s prose seems digressive, rest assured that everything he writes is to the point (as long as the reader patiently awaits the point)”

(“A Dream Within a Dream”). Based on these reviews, Freely accomplished her goal to render a “clear” text in English, regardless of the ambiguity and slipperiness of the original *Kara Kitap*.

The new, lucid, British translation of *The Black Book* does not stop some reviewers from their orientaling attitudes to the text. Beckman sees references to Sufi mysticism as “esoterica” and “folklore” (“*The Black Book*”). For this reviewer, it is still a novel, “deliciously infuriating, haunting and richly imaginative shaggy dog story and a maze of touching, humorous tales” (Beckman “*The Black Book*”). It is not really a compliment to read descriptions of the novel in adjectives pertaining to exotic food and flavors, which seems to be the legacy of the expression “Turkish delight.”

Michael McGaha and Azade Seyhan, who read the original and both translations, agree with my argument that although Freely’s translation is clear and readable, this aspect of her text does not do justice to the original *Kara Kitap*. Sayhan goes so far as calling it a “domesticating” version (*Tales* 213). McGaha writes that Freely accomplished a decent work translating Pamuk’s later novel, *Snow*, which was written in a style closer to Freely’s own (*Autobiographies* 120). Yet, as he acknowledges, there is an enormous stylistic distance that separates *Snow* and *The Black Book*. He sees Gün’s translation as a better fit to the original *Kara Kitap*. Indeed, Gün’s translation is more faithful to the spirit of Pamuk’s idiom than Freely’s clear and smooth narrative. The opaqueness of Gün’s translation is an outcome of Pamuk’s abstruse mode of expression and convoluted sentence structure in *Kara Kitap* rather than of Gün’s translational skills.

Maureen Freely's *The Black Book*

As I mentioned earlier, the first two chapters of *The Black Book* are significant in that they establish the plot line, supply context for subsequent chapters, signal the structure of the novel, and establish the imagery developed in the rest of the text. The translational strategies Freely adopts in these two chapters are exemplary of how she translates the rest of the novel.

The most obvious characteristic of Freely's translation is the British accent in her language and the clarity of her text. She follows closely British syntax and vocabulary, thereby giving the text the illusion that it is a transparent copy of the original. Specific examples demonstrate that, for the sake of clarity, she cut long sentences short, restructured long paragraphs, changed passive voice into active, used italics, dashes, and parenthetical insertions, and most importantly, highlighted the city imagery. In the afterword to the translation, Freely points out that her intention was to "preserve the music of the original." Yet, when compared to Gün's translation, Gün preserved the poetry of the original better. Furthermore, Freely often misses the referent of pronouns and paraphrases the original. Nevertheless, Pamuk authorized this translation. It is well known that Freely and Pamuk worked very closely on this translation: at times the translator was forced to compromise on her choices. This aspect of the translation process and product welcomes further study and would be a supplement to my study here, which is based on close study of original and translation, identifying "deviations" and providing contextual explanations for these deviations.

A close study of the new translation of *The Black Book* provides alternative explanations to those that guide most recent research on retranslation. Freely's translation reveals that there are factors other than the intention to "correct the initial translation" that guide new translations. The new translation is another version of the original, a product of a new context, and reveals the

author's preoccupation with how his image will circulate internationally. Pamuk's desire to be known as the author of the city coincides with his translator's nostalgic attitude to the city in which she grew up. Freely's translational choices strongly emphasize the city imagery at the expense of others. This translational strategy is also supported by her focus on the city of Istanbul in two of her novels, *Enlightenment* and *The Life of a Party*. As the beginning of Freely's translation below demonstrates, her translation is straightforward, thus giving the impression that it is more literal and "faithful" to the original. However, it is not only less literal but also less accurate. Pamuk writes:

Yatağın başından ucuna kadar uzanan mavi damalı yorganın engebeli, gölgeli vadileri ve mavi yumuşak tepeleriyle örtülü tatlı ve ılık karanlıkta Rüya yüzükoyun uzanmış uyuyordu. Dışarıdan kış sabahının ilk sesleri geliyordu: Tek tük geçen arabalar ve eski otobüsler, poğaçasıyla işbirliği eden salepçinin kaldırıma konup kalkan güğümleri ve dolmuş durağının değnekçisinin düdüğü. Odada, lacivert perdelerin soldurduğu kurşuni bir kış ışığı vardı. Uyku mahmurluğu ile Galip, karısının mavi yorgandan dışarı uzanan başına baktı: Rüya'nın çenesi yastığın kuştüyüne gömülmüştü. Alnının eğiminde, o sırada aklının içinde olup biten harika şeyleri insana korkuyla merak ettiren gerçekdışı bir yan vardı. "Hafıza," diye yazmıştı bir köşe yazısında Celal, "bir bahçedir." "Rüya'nın bahçeleri, Rüya'nın bahçeleri..." diye düşünmüştü o zamanlar Galip, "düşünme, düşünme, kıskanırsın!" Ama Galip karısının alnına bakarak düşündü. (KK 11)

Freely renders the first paragraph of the novel thus:

Rüya was lying facedown on the bed, lost to sweet warm darkness beneath the billowing folds of the blue checkered quilt. The first sounds of a winter morning seeped in from outside: the rumble of a passing car, the clatter of an old bus, the rattle of the copper

kettles that the salep maker shared with the pastry cook, the whistle of the parking attendant at the *dolmuş* stop. A cold leaden light filtered through the dark blue curtains. Languid with sleep, Galip gazed at his wife's head: Rüya's chin was nestling in the down pillow. The wondrous sights playing in her mind gave her an unearthly glow that pulled him toward her even as it suffused him with fear. *Memory*, Celal had written once in a column, *is a garden*. Rüya's gardens, Rüya's gardens... Galip thought. Don't think, don't think, it will make you jealous! But as he gazed at his wife's forehead, he still let himself think. (BB 3)

For comparative purposes, I provide Gün's version of the first paragraph:

Rüya slept on her stomach in the sweet and warm darkness under the blue-checkered quilt which covered the entire bed with its undulating, shadowy valleys and soft blue hills. The first sounds of the winter morning penetrated the room: carts passing by sporadically and old buses, the salep maker, who was in cahoots with the pastry man, banging his copper jugs up and down on the sidewalk, the whistle of the shill at the *dolmuş* stop. The navy-blue drapes leached out the leaden winter light that came into the room. Galip, languid with sleep, studied his wife's head which poked out of the quilt: Rüya's chin was buried in the down pillow. In the curve of her brow there was something surreal that brought on anxious curiosity about the wondrous events that took place inside her head. "Memory," Jelal had written in one of his columns, "is a garden." Then Galip had thought: Gardens of Rüya, Gardens of Dreaming. Don't think, don't think! If you do, you will suffer jealousy. But Galip couldn't help thinking as he studied his wife's brow. (BB 3)

Close study of Freely's translation reveals that she tones down Pamuk's exuberance in the original, simplifying the style to make it more like the style he would adopt in his late novels and like her own characteristic style. When read against Gün's translation, it is clear that Gün's verbal and syntactical choice preserves the poetry of the original better. Freely's Rüya is "lying facedown." This is one possible way of rendering Pamuk's "yüzükoyun uzanmış uyuyordu" (literally "was sleeping facedown"). It indicates that Freely translates situationally and descriptively. Gün's translation "Rüya slept" right from the beginning establishes the sleepy and allusive character Rüya is. Her name juxtaposed to the verb "to sleep" is Gün's strategic choice, which connects with how she translates the rest of the novel. As a translator, she uses every opportunity to recreate in English the suggestiveness and allusions of the original. Freely, on the other hand, opts for words that are literal on the level of vocabulary but do not always invoke the suggestiveness they carry in the original. Her strategy to make the text clear is obvious in her choice to list one by one the sounds "seeping in" from outside. Pamuk's sentence, however, reflects the messiness of the sounds coming from outside both on the level of vocabulary and on the level of syntax. While Gün translates the word "gerçekdışı" (literally "unreal") as "surreal," Freely provides only a free paraphrase of that sentence which could also be called an inaccuracy. As I discussed in more detail in chapter 2, Gün recreates Pamuk's baroque style through a word choice that is suggestive. For instance, for his "harika şeyleri" (literally "wonderful, marvelous things") in this paragraph, she prefers "surreal" thereby evoking surrealism and establishing the path for the dreamlike, fantastic, and illusory nature Rüya has for Galip in the rest of the text. Pamuk has quotation marks at the end of the paragraph to indicate Celal's words. However, it is still not clear which words belong to Celal, which to Galip, and which to the narrator. That is in line with the unreliable narrator in the rest of the novel. Gün follows this aspect of the original

closely and retains the quotation marks. Freely uses italics to indicate Celal's words. This strategy is appropriate in that Celal doesn't have a physical presence in the text and the reader gets to know him as much as his newspaper columns allow. That is, while Rüya is an illusion, a dream, and the thoughts in Galip's mind, Celal is a text. However, this also establishes a clear-cut interpretation of subtleties in the novel that are not clear-cut in the original. Although clear and straightforward, Freely's translation does not recreate in English the allusive and suggestive nature of the opening of the original novel: the implications of the names, the pseudo-real relationship between Galip and Rüya, and the lurking voice of Celal in Galip's head.

Overall, Gün preserves the poetry of the original better, although Freely claims to have preserved the "music" of the original better, as she writes in her afterword. The "undulating, shadowy valleys and soft blue hills" in Gün's version were there in the Turkish ("Gölgeli vadileri ve mavi yumuşak tepeleriyle"), but have been reduced to "billowing folds" in Freely's English. In the second sentence, "arabalar" can mean either "carts" or "cars," but in Istanbul in the 1980s one was far more likely to hear the noise of carts rather than cars of food vendors in the early morning. Gün is more sensitive to the chronotope of the original than Freely is. Gün's "In cahoots with" is a better translation of "işbirliği eden" than the neutral "shared with"; the Turkish term has pejorative connotations such as being a "comprador," "quisling," or "collaborationist." Pamuk does mention that the salep maker is banging his jugs up and down on the sidewalk ("kaldırıma konup kalkan güğümleri"), not just "rattling" them, as Freely would have it. "Shill" may not be the best translation of "değnekçi," since it connotes a deception or swindle. However, the "değnekçi" is like a shill in the sense that it is his job to lure potential customers to the *dolmuş* and control the line of people waiting to board. The word can mean "parking attendant," but not in the context of a *dolmuş* stop. Neither Gün nor Freely has chosen to translate or explain

the word *salep* (a hot drink made from a powdered tuber) or *dolmuş* (a shared taxi). In an interview with Esin Erdim, Gün said that these words “give a flavor to the text without smelling translation” (“The ‘Survival’” 217). These are words that one hears constantly in Turkey, and the things they stand for are an integral part of Turkish culture. Gün also says that she does not explain such terms in the translations: “Let them find out if they’re interested, no local color, you know, I don’t explain what *dolmuş* is... they’ll eventually find it” (“The ‘Survival’” 217). Freely apparently agreed with this practice, since she adopted it and carried it ever further than Gün had done. For example, Freely leaves the word “meyhane” in Turkish (40) (whereas Gün uses the word “taverns” [35]) and retains the Turkish “Usta” (59) –which most readers would surely mistake for a surname –whereas Gün translates it as “Master” (53).

Gün translates “perdeleler” with the American term “drapes,” whereas Freely uses “curtains.” A major difference between the two translations is Freely’s consistent use of British vocabulary. In the fifth sentence, the phrase “which poked out of the quilt,” omitted by Freely, is present in the Turkish, which even specifies “the blue quilt” (“mavi yorgan”); “buried” is the literal of the Turkish “gömülmüştü.” Again, Gün’s translation of the following sentence is almost word for word literal, with the exception that the word “gerçekdışı” actually means “unreal” rather than “surreal,” whereas Freely’s version is a very free paraphrase. Gün transliterates the name Celal as Jelal, because English speaking readers would almost certainly mispronounce the name if it were given in the Turkish spelling (as [Selal]). This would be especially problematic because Celal is one of the book’s main characters. His name is a reference to Mevlana Celaladdin Rumi, whose *magnum opus*, *The Mesnevi*, is a thematic intertext. Transliterating the name with a “J” retains the sound of the original and retains the intertextual reference between the two names and the themes they allude to. As a general rule, Gün is sparing in her use of

transliteration –far more so than Pamuk’s other translators, Holbrook or Göknaar. Freely simply leave all Turkish proper nouns in their original spelling, even retaining the spelling of “Alaadin,” the best-known character in the *Thousand and One Nights*. Gün translates the repetition of “Rüya’nin bahçeleri,” as “Gardens of Dreaming” to convey to English readers the important fact that the word “rüya” in Turkish is also a common noun meaning “dream.”

Reading the first two sentences of the passage above gives the impression that Freely’s translation is guided by sound and music. Her vocabulary “bed, beneath, billowing, blue-checked” creates the alliteration in the first sentence. “rumble,” “passing,” “clatter,” “rattle,” “copper,” “kettle,” “whistle,” “attendant” have two or more consonants repeating and suggesting the sound that comes from the outside in the wake of the morning. However, the rest of the text does not justify the claim that the music of the original is recreated in the translation. For instance, Freely translates Pamuk’s “Alaaddin’in vızır vızır işleyen dükkânı” (KK 5) as “Alaaddin’s bustling shop” (BB 6) while Gün’s “Aladdin’s store which buzzed with business” (13) recreates the sound of the original better. The Turkish name “Alaaddin” is the well-known “Aladdin” in English and in *The Nights* although Freely adamantly retains the original spellings of the names, therefore rendering the text exotic and distant, rather than aiming for common and bridging signs. Freely gives priority to other aspects of the translation. Freely’s punctuation is revealing. The colon in the second sentence and the listing of the sounds one by one gives order to the sentence and to the entire situation. The chaotic imagery that characterizes the original turns into a more ordered picture in Freely’s translation. As it is throughout the translation, the city imagery is put into order and its chaotic nature erased. This relates to, what I call, Freely’s nostalgic attitude towards Istanbul, where she spent her childhood. Her longing for the lost place is translated into the city imagery and given a clear picture, which the original lacks.

Freely's translation as a whole is dominated by her intention to render a clear text that follows a logical order and development. This approach is revealed in the city imagery. In chapter one of the novel, Galip recalls in a flashback when his and Rüya's mother used to take the children on boat trips in the Bosphorus:

Rüya'lar İstanbul'a taşındıktan altı ay sonar, Galip'le Rüya kabakulak olmuşlardı. O zamanlar, bazan Galip'in annesi bazan Rüya'nin güzel annesi Suzan yenge, bazan ikisi birden Galip'le Rüya'yi ellerinden tutup, parke yollarda titreyen otobüslerle Bebek'e ya da Tarabya'ya sandal gezintisine çıkarırlardı. O yıllarda mikroplar ünlüydü, ilaçlar değil: Boğaz'ın *temiz* havasının çocukların kabakulağına iyi geleceğine *inanılırdı*. Sabahları deniz durgun olurdu, sandal beyaz, aynı kayıkçı hep dostane. Anneler ve yengeler *sandalın kıçına* otururlardı, sırtı inip kalkan *sandalcının arkasına gizlenen Rüya'yla Galip* sandalın burnuna, yanyana. (KK 12; emphasis mine)

...Six months after Rüya's family moved to Istanbul, Galip and Rüya had both come down with mumps. *To speed their recovery*, Galip's mother and Rüya's mother, the beautiful Aunt Suzan, would take *the children* out to the Bosphorus; some days it would be just one mother taking them by the hand and other days it would be both; whatever bus they took, it shuddered as it rolled over the cobblestones, and wherever it took them —*Bebek or Tarabya*—the *high point of the excursion was a tour of the bay* in a rowboat. In those days it was microbes people feared and respected, not medicines, and *everyone agreed that the pure air of the Bosphorus* could cure children of the mumps. The sea was *always* calm on those mornings, and the rowboat white; it was always the same friendly boatman *waiting to greet them*. The mothers and aunts would sit at the *back of the*

rowboat, Rüya and Galip side by side at the front, *shielded from their mothers' gaze* by the rising and falling back of the boatman. (BB 4; emphasis mine)

A close comparison between the translation and the original shows that Freely often resorts to free paraphrase. First, she adds “to speed their recovery” in order to establish a logical connection between the sentence preceding and the one that follows. There is no such explanatory connection in the original. Second, in the same sentence Freely avoids repeating the names Galip and Rüya and replaces them with “the children.” This is the translator’s way of improving the repetitious nature of the original. Third, Freely sets aside the names of the two neighborhoods, Bebek and Tarabya, with dashes, a strategy she resorts to often in order to reorder and clarify the sentence. In addition, the phrase “high point of the excursion was a tour of the bay” is added, making the translation of this sentence a free paraphrase. Another strategy Freely often adopts in order to render the meaning of Pamuk’s sentences clear is to change the passive into active. However, this strategy interferes with another aspect of the original and that is its allusion to the oral narrative tradition in Turkish. While the original literally says “it was believed,” thereby reinforcing the belief in superstition and hearsay, Freely renders this as “everybody agreed.” In the original the air is “temiz” (literally “clean”); Freely renders it as “pure.” In the following sentence, she repeats the word “always,” thus freezing the moment, although it is used only once in the original. “The friendly boatman” in the original is “the friendly boatman waiting to greet them” in Freely. Galip’s flashback in the original turns out to be an occasion for Freely to recreate the moment in line with her own reminiscences of the city as she reveals them in numerous interviews. The repetition of the word “always” freezes the moment as eternal. The word “pure” adds the implication that the air was immaculate, unadulterated, untouched, refined, free from pollution, which could be true only in nostalgic

recollections of the Bosphorus air. Trips to Bebek and Tarabya were “the high point of the excursion” in Freely’s childhood.

Pamuk does not abstain from obscene language when he sees it fit, as he writes “sandalın kışına” (literally “the butt-end of the boat”). Freely replaces it with an “acceptable” English “back of the rowboat.” This paragraph ends with Freely’s mistranslation of Pamuk’s text. In the original, Pamuk implies mischievously that Galip and Rüya even as kids would take the opportunity to hide from their parents and do things: “sırtı inip kalkan sandalcının arkasına gizlenen Rüya’yla Galip” (literally “Rüya and Galip who were hiding behind the rising and falling back of the boatman”). Freely’s translation “shielded from their mothers’ gaze by the rising and falling back of the boatman” carries the implication that they were shielded by parents by accident and not intentionally, which is not correct. That is, as characteristic of her entire translation, Freely renders a clear text at the expense of deviating from the original based on syntax, voice, and word choice. By ignoring different registers in the original, such as the echoes of the oral tradition, the superstitious nature of the beliefs of the characters, and Pamuk’s use of “low” language, she creates a text that is smooth and reads unobtrusively. Objects and places that relate to the city of Istanbul carry her nostalgic touch. The original text is thick, loaded, repetitive, and enigmatic, due to the Turkish sentence structure in which the verb comes at the end and generates mystery.

As I pointed out above, Freely often uses punctuation to give order, “meaning,” and logic to the text and clarify Pamuk’s original, as with the use of colon. The ellipsis that precedes the passage is her way of signaling the flashback. In the preceding passage, the omniscient narrator narrates Galip’s presence. Beginning with this passage, the narrator, partially assuming Galip’s point of view, tells of Galip’s childhood and the first time he saw Rüya. In Pamuk’s original

there is no break and no ellipsis. Therefore, it is difficult for the reader to grasp the conceptual break. Freely makes this situation clear. Another strategy that Freely uses to clarify the multiplicity of voices in the text is the use of italics. The sentences that precede the passage above read thus: “*Well, hello! So you’re a regular here too, are you?* ... Excuse me brother, when exactly did you run into my wife, or were you introduced? Three years ago at your house ... No, perhaps Rüya’s memories were not so cruelly crowded” (3-4). Through the use of ellipses and italics, Freely makes clear the multiplicity of voices that figure out in the text.

Freely’s favorite way of making clear Pamuk’s text in English is inserting some of the information of the original text in parentheses and setting it aside from the organic wholeness of the text. This strategy helps her clarify some of Pamuk’s long sentences. However, what she chooses to set in parentheses has implications as to how the text as a whole is read and interpreted. The overuse of this strategy ends up making obvious some of the subtleties of Pamuk’s text. In addition, Freely’s word choice, which is purely intended to make the text as clear as possible, goes beyond what the original text was intended to be. The original is heavily marked by the unstable and unreliable narrator. One can go as far as claim that Galip is a psychotic and Celal and Rüya are products of his imagination. It is impossible to arrive at the same interpretation via Freely’s translation, which heavily marks the differences between these characters.

An apt example of Freely’s use of parentheses comes in chapter one. The chapter has an intricate chronological structure. It begins with the present, flashes back to Galip’s childhood to reveal the roots of the present, and by the end of the chapter, returns to the present only to connect with Celal’s newspaper column, the second chapter, which actually comments on Galip’s present. Pamuk writes that it is exactly 19 years, 19 months, and 19 days after Galip saw

Rüya that they got married. As I discussed in more detail in chapter one of this work, the number nineteen carries significance for the overall structure of the novel. Pamuk carefully calculated the temporal structure of the novel, in which part one consists of nineteen chapters and corresponds to Galip's physical journey searching for his wife. The first reference to the number "nineteen" is in chapter one, where Pamuk vaguely suggests the temporal structure of the plot and of the novel itself. Freely places the reference to time in parenthesis and adds further explanation. This strategy makes this aspect of the novel too obvious: "(by Galip's calculations, their wedding day came exactly nineteen years, nineteen months, and nineteen days after their first meeting)" (*BB* 13). There are no parentheses in the original. The original text does not allow for precision. Freely breaches this aspect of the original by inserting the information in parentheses as if providing a clarification and adding the word "exactly." In the original, the ambiguous reference to time is also a sign that Galip's mind is not clear as to when exactly the events happened. Everything for him seems to be in the nature of a dream.

It is interesting to note that Gün inserts parentheses into the same sentence as well. However, she does not insert the number but a piece of information which, in line with the original, maintains the ambivalence: "Much later after their first meeting, 19 years, 19 months and 19 days after (according to Galip's calculation)" (*BB* 11). Gün's translation provides Galip, the dreamy character, as the source of the numbers and of the calculation, thereby implying the narrator's suspicion of that. Freely's translation does not suggest such subtleties.

Similar to Freely's translation strategy above, Galip creates a Galip character who is much more stable and composed than he is in the original. Pamuk's Galip is quiet, observing, and with a tendency to eavesdrop on others. As a child, he would often overhear what the elders talked about. As an adult, his insecurities surface in the opening of the novel when he observes

his wife sleeping and contemplates the male figures that might be occupying her dreams. His mind rambles from place to place and he free associates between the table cloth that used to be on the kitchen table in his parents' house, the blue cover the barber used to wrap around him when he was getting his hair cut as a child, and the blue-checked quilt that covers his sleeping wife. Pamuk's text consistently pictures Galip in these terms while Freely's word choice gives him a more stable profile. Pamuk writes: "Galip, gazetenin kapının altından atılmış olacağını düşünerek" (KK 20; literally "thinking that the paper might have been pushed under the door"). Freely's Galip is a character sure of himself. She translates the same sentence as: "Galip was *sure* they would have pushed the newspaper under the door by now" (12).

Below is an example of one of Pamuk's notorious long sentences. His attention to detail results in sentences in which the reader easily loses track of the subject-object relationship. The list of items and their adjectives that are inserted between the subject "Babaanne'yle Dede" (grandmother and grandfather) and the verb "sürekli konuşurlardı" (were talking continuously) is very long, exemplifying how dense Pamuk's original text is. It could be argued that Pamuk's intention was to recreate the mundane patter of the grandfolks. In either case, the way Freely translates the sentence is a clear example of how she restructures by cutting sentences short and altering the passive voice into active. Pamuk writes: "*Babaanne'yle Dede*, sabahtan akşama kadar açık duran ve Türk köpeklerine benzemeyen bol tüylü ve huzurlu bir köpek biblosunun üzerinde uyuduğu radyodaki alaturka ve alafranga müziği, haberleri ve banka, kolonya ve milli piyango reklamlarını dinlerlerken *sürekli konuşurlardı* (KK 14; emphasis mine). Freely translates thus:

Although the radio was on from the first thing in the morning till the last thing at night, the thick-coated and not-at-all-Turkish-looking china dog curled up on top of it never

woke from his peaceful slumber. As *alaturka* music gave way to *alafranga* –Western- music and the news faded into commercials for banks, colognes, and the national lottery, Grandfather and Grandfather kept up a steady patter. (*BB* 6)

Freely's translation cuts the long sentence into two and rearranges the parts in a way that gives a clear picture of the situation. She turns one of Pamuk's objects ("the dog") into the subject of the first sentence and another object ("the radio") into the subject of the dependent clause. She moves the subject and the verb of Pamuk's sentence to the second sentence thereby easing the burden of the reading by removing the details between the original subject and object. In italics, Freely retains the words "*alaturka*" and "*alafranga*" and adds the explanatory "Western" between dashes. That is, this transfer from Turkish into English problematizes the meaning of the word "translation" and calls for attention to the guiding norms of the text.

Gün's translation, which follows closely Pamuk's syntactical structure, is an ingenious solution to Pamuk's text, which often pushes the boundaries of Turkish grammar. Gün's faithfulness to Pamuk's syntax is what makes her translation dense, and the reason behind British book reviewers' attack on her translation.

Grandma and Grandpa talked right through the Turkish and Western music, the news, the commercials for banks, cologne, and the state lottery, as they listened to the radio which was on from morning to night, and on top of which slept the figurine of a thick-coated and self-confident dog that didn't look like a Turkish dog. (*BB* 6)

The same applies to the next sentence, which again for the sake of clarity Freely cuts into two and renders it in a way which makes the meaning of the original less ambiguous. Pamuk's sentence:

Çoğu zaman, hiç dinmediği için alıştıkları bir diş ağrısından sözeder gibi ellerindeki sigaralardan şikayet ederlerdi, hâlâ bırakamadıkları için suçu birbirlerine atarak, biri boğulur gibi oksürmeye başlarsa, öteki, önce zafer ve neşeyle, sonra endişe ve öfkeyle haklı olduğunu ilan ederek! (KK 14)

Freely translates thus:

Mostly they complained about the cigarettes in their hands, but as wearily as if they'd been suffering from a toothache so long they'd accustomed themselves to the pain. They would blame each other for failing to kick the habit, and if one went into a serious coughing fit, the other would proclaim, first triumphantly and then fretfully, peevishly, that the accusations were true! (6)

Gün manages to translate it faithfully to the form of the original, maintaining clarity of the meaning:

Often they complained about the cigarettes between their fingers as if talking about a toothache they'd become accustomed to because it never ceased, blaming each other for their failure to quit; and if one commenced to cough as if drowning, the other proclaimed being in the right; first with victory and merriment, then with anxiety and anger. (6)

Freely's translation-as-editing could be seen in her alteration of one short sentence in Pamuk.

She not only cuts the sentence into two, but also inserts a paragraph break in between the two new sentences. Pamuk writes: "Arkasında, *memlekete* dönüş yollarının mayınlandığını yazan bu kahverengi-beyaz kartpostaldan ve savaştan çok sonra gittiği Fas'tan, başka siyah beyaz kartpostallar da yollamış (KK 17). Literally, "After he left, he sent this brown-white postcard on which he wrote that the roads leading home were mined and long after the war when he went to

Morocco, he sent other black and white postcards.” Freely translates this sentence, which is in the middle of a three-page paragraph in the original thus:

On the back of his brown-and-white postcard, *Uncle Melih* had written that all routes back to *Turkey* had been mined.

The war was long over when he sent another postcard, this one black and white, from Fez” (10).

In order to make clear the referent of the pronoun, she inserts “Uncle Melih.” What to Pamuk is “home” (“memleket,” that is, literally “home country”), Freely replaces with “Turkey.” Also she mistook Pamuk’s “Fas” which is the country of Morocco for the city of Fez in Morocco. From the context of this passage it is understood that Pamuk is talking about news exchange between countries and not cities.

In this section of her translation, Freely cuts Pamuk’s a page-long paragraph (KK 16–18) into four paragraphs. The paragraph mentioned consists of sixteen sentences, which Freely renders in twenty one sentences (BB 8–10). Pamuk loads the section with details, describing Uncle Melih’s whereabouts, his “business investigations” abroad, and romantic affairs. These details are revealed to the reader through little Galip’s perspective, who either reads details on postcards sent by Melih from abroad or overhears his elders talking about these things. This section occupies a significant portion of the first chapter and it is very important for the rest of the novel because all of the images and relationships that will be developed in the rest of the novel are laid out here. Also, what would make a reader read the rest of the novel is how intriguing this chapter is. Pamuk’s text lays out many details without really connecting them. He leaves the connections open and maintains ambiguity as to the nature of the relationships

between characters. Freely organizes these details and establishes connections between them.

While Pamuk's text often reads as a first draft, Freely's translation reads as a polished one.

Another example of Freely's restructuring and laying out clearly of ideas in the original is the following. In Freely's translation below, Pamuk's three lengthy sentences take on an entirely different form, so much so that one wonders whether Freely translates or paraphrases Pamuk's ideas. In a typical manner, Pamuk includes many details and ideas into a single sentence, pushing the boundaries of both grammar and logic:

Apartmanı yaptırmaya başladıklarında Melih Amca buradaymış daha, Celal'in Galip'e yıllar sonar anlattığı gibi, şekerçi Hacı Bekir'in dükkanı ve lokumlarıyla rekabert edemediği için ve Babaanne'nin kaydattığı ayva, incir ve vişne reçellerini raflarına dizdikleri kavanozlarda satabileceklerini bildikleri için, önce pastaneye, daha sonra lokantaya çevirdikleri Sirkeci'deki şekerçi dükkanından ve Karaköy'deki Beyaz Eczane'den gelen babası ve kardeşleriyle buluşmak için, o zamanlar daha otuzuna basmamış olan Melih Amca da, içinde avukatlıktan çok kavga ettiği ve eski dava dosyalarının sayfalarına kurşun kalemle gemi ve ıssız ada resimleri çizdiği yazıhanesinden aksamüstleri çıkıp, Nişantaşı'ndaki inşaat yerine gelir, ceket ve kravatını çıkarıp, kollarını sıvayıp paydos saatine doğru gevşeyen inşaat işçilerini kızdırmak için işe girişirmiş. (KK 16)

In my translation, the passage above literally reads thus:

When they started the construction of the apartment building, Uncle Melih was around at that time, as Celal told Galip years later, because he could not compete with the confection seller Hacı Bekir's store and his lokums and because he knew that they could sell Grandmother's hand made quince, fig, and cherry jam, whose jars they shelved, to

meet with his father and brothers, who came first from the patisserie and later from the confectionary in Sirkeci, which they turned into a restaurant, and from the “White Pharmacy” in Karaköy, Uncle Melih, who was not even thirty at that time, in the evenings, he used to leave his attorney office, where he used to quarrel and draw ship and deserted islands on the pages of old case files rather than work, he used to come to the construction site in Nişantaşı, he took off his jacket and tie, pulled up his sleeves, so that he could inspire the construction workers, who used to slack off as it came close to the end of their work day.

Freely translates the passage thus:

As Celal told Galip many years later, Uncle Melih was still in Istanbul –and not yet thirty– when they’d started building the apartments. Every afternoon, he would leave the law office (where he did little other than quarrel or sketch ships and desert islands on the backs of old legal dossiers) to join his father and his brothers at the construction site in Nişantaşı. The workmen would be slacking off as the end of the workday approached; much to their annoyance, Uncle Melih would take off his jacket, roll up his sleeves, and set to work. The family owned two concerns at the time: the White Pharmacy in Karaköy and a candy shop in Sirkeci that later became a patisserie and then a restaurant. They couldn’t compete with Hacı Bekir, whose *lokums* were said to be the best in the city, though they were more optimistic about the small jars of Grandmother’s quince, fig, and cherry jam lining the shelves on the walls. (8-9)

The most striking change that Freely makes is to turn the single sentence into five sentences. She adds “Istanbul” when it is not in the original. The addition does not contribute to the clarity of the sentence, either. It is clear from the context that the apartment building is in the city and the

idea follows from the previous paragraph. It only serves to reemphasize the place of the city in the text and directs how the novel is going to be interpreted. She adds it to the beginning of the sentence, which again reinforces this emphasis while she moves other important details, such as Hacı Bekir and his lokums, and Grandmother's jars of jam, to the subsequent sentence. She adds dashes, colons, semicolons, and parenthetical clarification. Her punctuation reinforces her interpretation of the text and reorganizes the sentences into semantic sections, thus leading the readers' understanding. In addition, she mistranslates "inşaat işçilerini kızdırmak için" (literally, "to encourage/fire-up the construction workers) with "kızdırmak için" ("to annoy") when she renders the last part of the sentence as "much to their annoyance." Other additions by the translator are "were said to be the best in the city" and "though they were more optimistic about the small." Hacı Bekir's store is a landmark in Istanbul for both locals and foreign citizens. Freely recalls the store in various interviews and essays as well as her translation.

Gün's translation is more faithful to the syntax of the original. In this specific example, she cuts Pamuk's long sentence into three sentences. She, also, adds a parenthetical indicator, which makes me suspect that Freely consulted Gün's translation. Yet, in line with Gün's overall style, this section in her translation sounds like a story in a story related by Celal to Galip rather than as the plain narrative that it is in Freely's version.

The first chapter in *Kara Kitap* often reads as a rough draft, with parenthetical notes that could have served as reminders for an undone revision of his narrative. The following sentence is an apt example:

Önce Avrupa ve Afrika'dan, sonra da İzmir'den İstanbul'a ve apartmana dönmesi yıllar alan Melih Amca'yı berberin her tıraşta, meraktan çok ağız alışkanlığıyla Dede'ye sorduğunu, (Efendim, büyük oğlu Afrika'dan ne zaman dönüyor?), ve Dede'nin de, bu

sorudan ve bu konudan hoşlanmadığını bildiği için Galip, Dede'nin aklındaki uğursuzluğun en büyük ve en tuhaf oğlunun eski karısı ve ilk oğlunu bir gün bırakarak yurtdışına gidişi ve yeni karısı ve yeni kızıyla (Rüya) dönüşü ile ilgili olduğunu daha o zamanlardan sezerdi. (KK 15-6)

The most peculiar aspect of this sentence is its sheer length. It is extremely difficult to dig out the subject (Galip) among various objects (Melih Amca, Dede, berber, en büyük ve en tuhaf oğlunun eski karısı ve ilk oğlu), various settings (Avrupa, Afrika, İzmir, İstanbul, apartman), and the relationship between these settings and objects, that Uncle Melih is the unruly son of the grandfather and that there are some family issues, which the grandfather does not want to be questioned about by the barber. Pamuk could have easily used quotation marks for the question in the first parentheses. It is a question that the barber asks the grandfather and there is not really a need for a parenthetical insertion. He could have inserted Rüya's name organically into the text, without the parenthetical addition. As it stands, the sentence is extremely confusing and unclear even to a careful reader.

Freely's translation is indispensable in understanding how this sentence connects to the rest of the information provided in this first and crucial chapter and what exactly it means:

Whenever the barber asked after him –So, when's that eldest son of yours returning from Africa?– Grandfather would bridle; seeing his reluctance to discuss the matter, Galip was aware even then that Grandfather's "bad luck" had begun when his oldest and strangest son had gone abroad, leaving his wife and their son Vasif behind, only to return years later with a new wife and a new daughter (Rüya, which was also the Turkish word for *dream*). (8)

First of all, Freely removes the parenthesis and uses dashes for the barber's question. She adds a semi-colon (;) to reorganize the long and confusing sentence. She places "bad luck" in quotations to connect it to Grandfather's words a paragraph earlier in the text, where she also used quotation marks. A very important change Freely makes is the addition of "Vasif" a character who is mentioned in the text earlier but left unclear as to who he is and how he relates to the rest of the characters. From Freely's translation, we realize that he was Melih's first son, who is physically deformed and left to the grandparents to tend while Melih travels abroad. It is impossible to make these inferences from Pamuk's text. Even in Freely's text, it is left unclear as to whether Melih divorced his first wife or whether he took a new wife without a divorce. Compared to Freely's transition, Gün's translation of the same passage follows Pamuk's thoughts unfolding. She abstains from clarifying and retains the two parenthetical phrases as in Pamuk's text. She is a conscientious translator, who did not use "translators' liberty" to alter the text. On the other hand, Freely demonstrates more freedom although and because the translation is supervised by the original author. Gün's word choice in the same passage recreates the sound of the original better: "his oldest and oddest son," "they sold off flat by flat" "the place was jinxed," "and then his return, when he did return" (7). Gün alternates "apartment building" and "apartment compound" in this one long sentence to make clear to English-speaking readers that this is a building with several apartments in it, bringing together the son's families and the grandsons. Freely leaves out the reference to the building.

In the passage above, Freely reveals the meaning of the name Rüya. She inserts it in parenthesis and italicizes it, thus doubly emphasizing it. At this point, it becomes clear that the character Rüya is going to be central to the book and is going to function on multiple levels. This explanation sets Rüya apart especially because so far there multiple characters introduced in the

text, whose names also carry significance, such as Galip, Celal, Melih, and Vasıf. None of these names were explained the way Rüya's name was. Parenthetical explanation and insertion of information is characteristic of Freely's translation. Although this strategy makes the meaning of the text very clear, it also interferes with the original's more subtle and ambiguous aspects. Freely's aim to render a clear text is further contradicted by the two epigraphs preceding the chapter. Adli warns the reader and the writer: "Never use epigraphs –they kill the mystery in the work!" It is followed by Bahti's response: "If that's how it has to die, go ahead and kill it; then kill the false prophet who sold you on the mystery in the first place" (3). These two epigraphs reveal Pamuk's intention in this chapter and are a direct reference to the "mystery" in the whole book. Freely's translation kills the mystery, though.

The following passage is a flashback in which Galip remembers his grandparents' strange habits. In the original, Pamuk is laconic. Through his specific choice of vocabulary, he points to the subtle use of language difference that also marks class difference.

Gene de, sokağa çıkıp dükkana gittiği günlerdeki gibi giyinirdi: Pazarlari uzayan sakali gibi kurşuni renkli, geniş yakalı, eski bir İngiliz ceket, *dökülen pantolon*, kol düğmeleri ve Baba'nin dediği gibi, kaytan bir memur kravatı. Anne "gırvat" demez, "kravat" derdi: *Ekiden Anne'nin ailesi daha zengin olduğu için.* (KK 13; emphasis mine)

Freely translates the above passage thus:

Even so, he still dressed every morning, just as he'd done in the days when he went out to the store: *wrinkled trousers*, cuff links, an old English jacket with wide lapels that was as gray as the stubble that grew on his cheeks on Sundays, and what Father called a silk necktie. *Mother refused to call it a necktie –she called a cravate; coming as she did from*

a family that had once prided itself on being wealthier than Father's family; she liked to put on Western airs. (BB 5; emphasis mine)

This is another example of how Freely rearranges sentences and explains what is only suggested in the original. First, she rearranges the items after the colon, in the first sentence. While “ceketi” is the first item in the list describing the grandfather’s outfit, Freely places it at the end of the sentence. The reason for this could be the long adjective phrase that qualifies the noun “jacket,” that is, for syntactical reasons. Nevertheless, it points to the extent of the liberty Freely takes under “the original author’s permission.” In the subsequent sentence, Pamuk puns on the Turkish word “kravatı,” which means “necktie.” In Turkish, a certain way of pronouncing words is associated with the class of the speaker. “gırvat” is how lower class or uneducated/illiterate people pronounce the word. Thus, Pamuk implies how much the social structure of the Turkish society is embedded in the language. Freely’s translation does not aim to recreate the meaning through a pun. Rather, she chooses to explain the meaning albeit with misleading information. Freely’s “she liked to put on Western airs” is not justified by the original in any way. Gün finds an ingenious way to translate the sentences above as literally and succinctly as possible without sacrificing the pun:

Even so, he dressed up just as he did in those days when he had gone out to the store: his old English jacket with wide lapels which was gray like the stubble that grew on his face on Sundays, drop trousers, cuff links, and a narrow tie that Dad called “the bureaucrat’s cravat.” Mom said “*cravate*,” never “cravat”: her family had been better off than his in the old days. (5)

The comparison between Freely’s and Gün’s translations often makes clear that Freely consulted Gün’s translation. Also, Gün’s use of the British word “trousers” above belies British reviewers’

critique that she “americanized” the text. It is clear that those reviews give a simplistic and a homogeneous picture of Gün’s translation. She often *does* use British words and phrases, which makes her translation resonate with a multiplicity of registers while Freely’s translation reads as a plain and straightforward English text. Gün’s choice of “Mom, Dad, Grandma, Grandpa” is more appropriate in that context than Freely’s “Mother, Father, Grandfather, Grandmother” since that particular moment in the text is the flashback in which Galip remembers his childhood and the world is revealed through the little Galip’s eyes. Gün’s translation is more sensitive to the particularities of the situation narrated, the narrative voice, and how this is reflected in the language of the translation.

Wherever possible, Pamuk seizes upon the opportunity to comment on the disastrous past of Turkish letters, the language reforms in Turkey, and how these events impacted the language. Although Pamuk follows the global trends and attitudes of postmodernist writers, he often brings those home to reflect on local issues. In the following example, Pamuk comments ironically and in parentheses on the newly invented Turkish vocabulary. The word “kuzin” in Turkish (“cousin” in English) is considered to be a purely Turkish word substituting for older expressions. By inserting additional information in parenthesis, Pamuk points out ironically that the word “kuzin” is not a pure Turkish word, which language engineers intended it to be, but a borrowing from French. He writes: “O zamanlar Galip, kendi yaşında olduğu söylenen *amcasının kızı* (*yeni kelime ile kuzin*) Rüya’dan çok, Rüya’nin içinde yattığı cebinliğin insanı hayale çağıran korkutucu ve uykulu mağarası eliyle aralayarak içindeki kızını gösterirken” (KK 18; emphasis mine). “amcasının kızı” in Turkish means “his uncle’s daughter.” Although this expression is clear and does not need further clarification, Pamuk inserts a somewhat redundant explanation in parenthesis: “(*yeni kelime ile kuzin*)” (“the new word for ‘cousin’”). Freely’s translation is not

sensitive to these culture and language specific matters. In this particular instance, Freely mistakenly translates as if the paranthetical insertion is a further explanation. She writes: “his uncle’s daughter (or his cousin, as people are just beginning to say)” (11). Gün’s translation is especially sensitive to language matters. She translates it correctly: “his uncle’s daughter (called a ‘cousin’ in the new usage)” (10).

Another instance of Freely’s purely mistaken translation is the following. Pamuk writes “Çünkü bir avukatla yeniden evlenen annesi, her doktorun başka bir adla adlandırdığı bir hastalıktan genç yaşta ölünce, Celal, Aksaray’daki örümcekli evde barınamaz olmuş, Babaannesinin de ısrarıyla, yeniden apartmana dönmüş, çatı katına yerleşmişti” (KK 19). The main idea in the sentence above is that Celal’s mother had died and thus after his grandmother’s invitation, Celal moved back to the attic of the family building. Between two commas, Pamuk inserts a side comment that the mother died of an illness that every doctor gave a different name. Freely’s translation goes: “By now, Celal’s mother –she had married a lawyer, only to die young of a disease for which each doctor had another name– no longer able to bear the spider-filled house in Aksaray, had finally accepted Grandmother’s insistent invitation to return with Celal to the attic apartment, where Celal began his pseudonymous newspaper career” (11-2). As Freely renders it, it is as if Celal’s mother cannot bear the old Aksaray house and thus accepts Grandmother’s invitation. Gün translates it correctly: “heeding Grandma’s entreaties Jelal had returned to the compound and moved back into the attic apartment when he could no longer abide living in the spider-filled house in Aksaray after the untimely death of his mother who’d remarried a lawyer and died of some disease each doctor called by a different name” (10).

The passage below demonstrates Pamuk’s notoriously long sentences and justifies the idea that Pamuk is not really the stylist some book reviewers expect and assume him to be.

Freely’s translation of the passage is an example of a reductive translation:

Daha sonraları takma adla ilk köşe yazılarını yazacağı gazete için futbol maçlarını izleyerek şike kokusu almaya çalışıyor, Beyoğlu’nun arka sokaklarındaki bar, pavyon ve kerhane kabadayılarının esrarengiz ve sanatkarane cinayetlerini ballandırarak anlatıyor, kara karelerin sayısının ak kareleri her seferinde geçtiği bulmacalar hazırlıyor, gerektiğinde, afyonlu şarabın sarhoşluğundan ayılamadığı için tefrikasını aksatan üstadın yerine pehlivan tefrikasını sürdürüyor, zaman zaman da ‘Elyazısından Kişiliğinizi Okuyoruz,’ ‘Rüyalarınızı Yorumluyoruz,’ ‘Yüzünüz, Kişiliğiniz,’ ‘Bugünkü Burcunuz’ (akraba ve tanıdıklarına ve bir iddiaya göre de, sevgililerine özel selamlar yollamaya ilk bu burç köşesinde başlamıştı) ve ‘İster İnan İster İnanma’ köşelerine yazıyor ve artan vakitlerde de bedava girdiği sinemalarda gördüğü en son Amerikan filmlerini eleştiriyor ve çatı katında tek başına yaşamaya devam ederse, bu çalışkanlıkla gazetecilikten kazandığı parayla evlenebileceği bile söyleniyordu. (KK 19)

Freely translates:

Where Celal began his pseudonymous newspaper career: investigations into match-fixing; exaggerated accounts of thrilling and artfully executed murders in the bars, nightclubs, and brothels of Beyoğlu’s back streets; crossword puzzles in which the black squares always outnumbered the white; a serial on wrestlers (which he took over after the original author became addicted to opiated wine); various articles with titles like DISCOVER YOUR CHARACTER IN YOUR HANDWRITING, READ YOUR CHARACTER IN YOUR FACE, LET US INTERPRET YOUR DREAMS, and YOUR

HOROSCOPE TODAY (according to friends and relatives, it was in his horoscopes that he first started sending secret greetings to his lovers); he also did a BELIEVE IT OR NOT column and spent his spare time watching the latest American films for free and then reviewing them; impressed by his industry, people had even begun saying that he was doing journalism to build up his savings so he could take a wife. (12, capitalization in the original)

In her translation above, Freely uses colons, semi-colons, parentheses, and capital letters to set apart various details, the sentence communicates. Freely renders various details as part of a long list, separating them with colons and semi-colons. For instance, a sentence length dependent clause like “ilk koşe yazılarını yazacağı gazete için futbol maçlarını izleyerek şike kokusu almaya çalışıyor” (literally “for the newspaper where his first columns were going to be published, he would watch the soccer meets and try to smell the chicanery”) is abbreviated and rendered as “investigations into match-fixing.” Freely translates verbs as adjective phrases: “ballandırarak anlatıyor” (literally “narrates with exaggeration”) becomes “exaggerated accounts” in her translation. “bulmacalar hazırlıyor” (literally “prepares crossword puzzles”) is simply “crossword puzzles.” “pehlivan tefrikasını sürdürüyor” (literally “keeps up with his wrestling serial”) becomes simply “a serial on wrestlers.” She puts extended adjective and adverbial phrases such as “gerektiğinde, afyonlu şarabın sarhoşluğundan ayılamadığı için tefrikasını aksatan üstadın yerine” into parenthesis when in the original they are not. She capitalizes the column titles when they are not in the original. Column titles in Freely’s translation are in the form of imperative sentences while in the original they are noun phrases. Her titles explain while Pamuk’s titles are in the style of newspaper titles. For instance, “DISCOVER YOUR CHARACTER IN YOUR HANDWRITING” could have been rendered as

“Your Character in Your Handwriting.” Freely translates “Yüzünüz, Kişiliğiniz” [Your Face, Your Character] as “READ YOUR CHARACTER IN YOUR FACE.” It is clear that the title “Rüyalarınızı Yorumluyoruz” [“We interpret your dreams”] puns on the word “rüya” and refers to the actual character Rüya and to Galip’s “dreams.” Freely translates it as “LET US INTERPRET YOUR DREAMS” which does not carry across the pun in the original. Pamuk concludes the sentence in passive voice “[...] söyleniyordu” [literally “it was related”] thereby pointing out to the nature of rumors circulating around Celal and his habits. Freely adds a subject and turns it into active: “people had even begun saying that he was doing journalism.”

Güneli Gün translates what I call ‘strategically,’ that is, keeping in mind the entire text and carefully connecting images to one another, thereby strengthening the intertextual references within the novel. Maureen Freely, on the other hand, translates what I designate as ‘situationally.’ She explicates as she translates, providing information about certain situations and whenever she deems fit. One example that supports my argument here is that Freely turns original metaphors into similes. In the passage below, the child Galip recalls how he used to play as a kid. Pamuk writes:

Vasıf sağır ve dilsizdi ama benim yerlerde sürünürken ‘gizli geçit’ oynadığımı ve yatakların altından geçerek, mağaranın ucuna, *apartman karanlığının dibine* ulaşır gibi ve düşman siperlerine kazdığı bir tünelde *kedi sessizliğiyle ilerleyen* bir asker gibi ulaştığımı ve kendisiyle alay ettiğimi anlardı, ama *sonra gelen Rüya hariç*, ötekiler bilmezdi bunu. (KK 13; emphasis mine)

Freely translates thus:

Vasif was deaf and dumb, but when I played Secret Passage, he knew I wasn’t making fun of him; when I got on all fours and headed for the far end of the cave I knew to be

lurking in *the shadowy outer reaches of the apartment*, taking cover under beds as I ventured forward —*as stealthy as a cat*, as furtive as a soldier creeping through the tunnel that will lead him into enemy trenches —he understood me perfectly, but apart from Rüya, who wasn't there yet, no one else in the house knew this. (6; emphasis mine)

Gün translates thus:

Vasif was deaf and mute, but he understood that I was only playing “Secret Passage,” and not making fun of him, as I crept on the floor dragging myself under the beds to the end of the cave, as if to reach *the depth of darkness in the apartment building*, like a *soldier who proceeds with feline caution* in the tunnel he's dug into the enemy trenches; but all the others, aside from Rüya who arrived later, had no notion of how it was. (5; emphasis mine)

In the passages above, Pamuk's “kedi sessizliğiyle” (literally “with the silence of a cat”) is translated as “as stealthy as a cat” by Freely and as “with feline caution” by Gün. Pamuk's is an implied simile. Gün preserves the implied simile almost rendering it into a metaphor while Freely turns it into a stark simile. In chapter 2, I discussed in detail the strategy Gün adopts in order to translate the pun and resonance of the Turkish “apartman karanlığının” (literally “the airshaft in the apartment compound”). Freely translates it as “the shadowy outer reaches of the apartment,” which is not the meaning of the original. In the original, the image is a real physical space. At the same time, it is the writer's critique of fast modernization and the ugly architecture that is mushrooming in the city. It also stands for the space where the family dirt is accumulating, literally and metaphorically. Intertextually, it is a reference to Mevlana's *Mesnevi* and the pit in which Shams of Tebriz was found dead, or one of the obstacles Love has to overcome in order to reach Beauty in Şeyh Galip's *Beauty and Love*. A literal translation of the

image in English risks neglecting metaphorical implications of this central image. Gün translates it here for the first time as “the depth of darkness in the apartment building.” Later in her translation, she translates the same image as “the dark void,” thus establishing successive connections between the two different translations of the same image. This strategy allows Gün to come close to the multiplicity of meanings evoked by Pamuk’s image as well as to connect this culture specific image (that useless space in many of Istanbul buildings, a result of poor architecture and overcrowded streets) to something more universal, the dark side of the human nature. In the pairs above, Freely mistranslates Pamuk’s “sonra gelen Rüya hariç” [literally “apart from Rüya, who came later”] as “who wasn’t there yet” and in the same sentence, she adds “in the house,” which is not in the original.

A good example that supports my argument that Freely’s translation places an extra emphasis on the city of Istanbul is the following. In the first chapter when Galip’s grandparents discuss Celal’s writings and complain that he disgraces them by revealing family secrets in his newspaper column, the grandfather says “Apartman yazısında bizim apartmandan sözettiğini kim bilmiyor ki allahaşkına!” (KK 15; “For Heaven’s sake, who doesn’t really get it that the building he writes about in his column is our apartment building!”). Freely’s “For love of God, can there be anyone *in this city* who does not know that the apartment he mentions in that column is the one in which we sit?” (7). Here as well as throughout the novel she inserts references to the city when in the original there are none. This also connects to how Freely translates another central image in the novel, the name of the apartment building: Şehrikalp Apartmanı. In the first chapter of this dissertation, I discussed the intertextual aspects of this image. Very briefly, Pamuk draws on Şeyh Galip’s Ottoman Turkish romance *Hüsn Aşk* [*Beauty and Love*], where Aşk [Love] is banished to “Diyar-ı Kalp” or to the Land of the Hearts (in Holbrook’s translation) to get the

alchemy in order to be worthy of Hüsn's hand. One has to understand this allegory in the light of Sufi understanding of unity-of-being ontology. In this allegory Aşk's journey to "Diyar-ı Kalp" stands for the inner journey and the dervish path undertaken in order to realize the true nature of existence. On the path to Diyar-ı Kalp, Aşk overcomes obstacles, which symbolize his completion of "the journey through the levels of the soul at the point where it connects with spirit" (Şeyh Galip *Beauty and Love* xiii). He enters the Land of Hearts, which he never actually left, but now that his soul is purified and his heart can see clearly, he sees that Beauty is there, in his heart. He realizes that his perception was awry and in fact, he has never been separated from her. In reality, Love is Beauty and Beauty is Love. This realization takes place in Aşk's heart and "Diyar-ı Kalp" stands for the heart.

In *Kara Kitap*, Pamuk alludes to "Diyar-ı Kalp" by naming the apartment building "Şehrikalp" and adopts the theme of an inward journey. In the beginning, Galip literally searches for Rüya and Celal on the streets of Istanbul until he ends up at Celal's apartment in "Şehrikalp Apartmanı." Here, he embarks on an intellectual journey through Celal's writings in order to acquire "his memory banks" and to find out where they might be hiding. In analogy with Şeyh Galip's allegory, Pamuk's Galip fails to literally find them. Rather, he undergoes a journey inward and eventually realizes his potential as a writer in Celal's apartment, in Şehrikalp Apartmanı. In my second chapter, I discussed the implications of Gün's translation of the name as the "Heart-of-the-city- Apartments." Her translation does not retain the original pun. Rather, it connects with the family and its perception of itself as being important, central, and therefore, located at the heart of the city. The name "Heart-of-the-city- Apartments" stands as the family's coat of arms in Gün's translation.

Freely translates the name as “the City-of-Hearts Apartment” (8). She places “the City” at the beginning of the noun phrase and thus emphasizes the City of Istanbul. When Freely was working on the new translation, Holbrook has already completed her translation of *Beauty and Ask*, which was published in 2005 by the Modern Language Association. Holbrook translates “Diyar-i Kalp” as “the Land of the Hearts” (Galip 131). Clearly, Freely copies it only to replace “the Land” with “the City.” However, “the City of Hearts” carries a completely different meaning than Pamuk’s original intention although Freely wanted to retain the intertextual reference between the English translations of *Beauty and Love* and *The Black Book*. This central image in the text connects with the setting of the novel, the city of Istanbul. This might be why many of the reviews of the new translation read it as a “city novel.” Also, Freely’s translation, “the City-of-Hearts Apartment,” brings attention to the theme of human love in the novel (Galip’s search for his beloved wife) and the multiple love stories narrated in the text. It is possible to conclude that her interpretation highlights the setting and the plot at the expense of mistranslating the Persian ziyafet grammatical rule (which I discuss in more detail in chapter 2) by which Pamuk coins the noun phrase “Şehri Kalp.”

Freely’s mistranslation and goal to make the text clear ends up in erasing the strange, unexplainable, frightening aspects of the apartment compound, a significant image in the novel. In chapter one, Galip often broods over his Grandfather’s attitudes and feelings about the apartment compound, which he built for his family and which now he calls “uğursuz,” that is, “bringing bad luck.” Pamuk writes: “Galip, Dede’nin uğursuzluk dediği şeyin, belki de, apartmandaki bu tuhaf sıkışıklıkla, yersizlikle ya da buna yakın belirsiz ve korkutucu bir şeyle ilgili olduğunu da düşünmüştü” (KK 19). Galip sees the reason for Grandfather’s negative feelings about the apartment building to be related either to “tuhaf sıkışıklıkla, yersizlikle”

(“being related to some strange feeling of crowdedness and lack of space”) or to “buna yakın belirsiz ve korkutucu bir şeyle ilgili” (“similarly, to something fuzzy and frightening”). Freely translates thus: “Galip asked himself if Grandfather’s strange misgivings about the apartment building came from *his* feeling out of place or if it all went back to the day the home he’d built for his family was suddenly too small to contain it” (12; emphasis mine). Freely misses the referent of the pronoun. Her translation implies that it is the Grandfather, who feels out of place in the building; that he could not predict that the family would grow so big that the family compound would not be sufficient to contain them all. However, Pamuk implies that the grandfather thinks the place brings them bad luck and Galip reasons that this is due to its congested present and to some unexplainable and frightening things. Gün’s translation is true to the original: “he thought the jinx Grandpa talked about was connected to this odd congestion in the apartment compound, or to being out of place, or something else similarly indefinite and frightening” (10-11). Freely’s version smooths over the haunted picture of the original in which strange and unexplainable events happen.

Pamuk introduces the image of “apartman aralığı” (literally “apartment darkness”) “apartman karanlığı” (literally “apartment airshaft”) in chapter 1. He uses these two expressions alternately. As I discussed in more detail in chapter 2, Gün effectively translates the expression as “apartment airshaft” and the “dark void,” alternating the expressions thereby proliferating the meanings and allusions that these expressions call to. In the first chapter of the novel, the apartment airshaft is associated with the dark family relations that populate the apartment compound. It is a place ridden with mice, which in turn are compared to the people occupying the family building: “kahvaltı masasında Anne ile Baba, *apartman aralığını ele geçiren farelerden* ya da hizmetçi Esmâ Hanım’ın hortlak ve cinlerinden sözeder gibi, dün akşam *çatı*

katına yerleşenlerden sözediyorlardı” (KK 20; emphasis mine) A literal translation reads thus: “at the breakfast table, Mom and Dad, as if they were talking about the *mice that conquered the apartment darkness* and about Mrs. Esma, the maid’s, ghosts and jinnis, they were talking about *those who moved to the attic apartment* last night.”. Pamuk’s “apartman aralığı” is a metaphor for the dark and hidden aspects of the family’s affairs. Freely reorders Pamuk’s sentence and smooths over all the suggestiveness of the original. She does not even translate the expression “apartman aralığı”: “Mother and Father were eating breakfast, discussing the goings-on in the attic apartment in the same tones they used for the mice that ran between the walls of the apartment and that their Esma Hanim reserved for specters and djinns” (12). This image occurs again and again throughout the novel and has intertextual significance. It connects with Rumi’s Mesnevi and with the pit where Shams of Tebriz was found dead. It serves Pamuk’s critique of consumer fetishism and of fast modernization which resulted in ugly buildings in the city. Freely’s translation does not attend to the significance of this image. As I discussed in detail in chapter 2, Gün lays out all the necessary references for what later in the novel would merge into one, the apartment airshaft and the dark void. She translates this first reference to this image thus: “Mom and Dad were discussing the people who moved into the attic apartment as if talking about *the mice that commandeered the compound’s airshaft* or about the ghosts and jinns who hung out with Mrs. Esma, the maid” (11).

Chapter 2 in *The Black Book* is one of the most difficult to unpack sections. In terms of content, style, and tone, it defies conventional expectations. Following the more traditional narration and plot line of chapter 1, chapter 2 shocks the reader with its strange, apocalyptic, dark, gruesome, and archetypal narrative, which does not follow any standard line of development. As I mentioned before, it is Celal’s first newspaper column and the one which

Galip reads as he rides the *dolmuş* to work on a cold and rainy morning. Celal's apocalyptic tone dominates the narrative as he reflects on the present day of Istanbul citizens and their indifference to the deteriorating state of the Bosphorus. The main characters of this chapter are a certain "Beyoğlu haydutu" (in Freely's translation "Beyoğlu bandit," in Gün's words "Beyoğlu hood") and his "sevgili" (in Freely's words "his mistress," in Gün's words "his moll"), their haunting Black Cadillac, and various symbols of history that constitute different layers of the Bosphorus: skeletons of Celts and Ligurians, Byzantine treasures, a Romanian oil tanker, a British submarine (which torpedoed Turkish troops during the World War I and sank), the skeletons of English soldiers (who fought at the Gallipoli front), a battleship that belonged to Kaiser Wilhelm, a looted Genoan treasure, and skeletons of galley-slaves and Crusader knights.

In this chapter, Celal establishes himself as a demagogue, a writer with a dark tone, who could plunge into the layers of the historical archive, reveal the roots of the present day situation in Turkey, and prophesize the future. He opens the column with a prophetic question, "Did you know that the Bosphorus is drying up?" (16). He responds in the negative accuses his readers of being oblivious and insensitive to natural disasters. He states that they waste their time fighting and that they hardly ever read newspapers, or if they do read at all, they read them as they "struggle across overcrowded bus stops, as [they] sit yawning in those *dolmuş* seats that make every letter tremble," thus commenting on Galip's manner of reading the paper at that moment.

As I discussed in chapter 2, Gün adopts a heavily biblical tone and through her choice of vocabulary alludes to the biblical Apocalypse. Freely's translation, her choice of journalistic terminology, phrasing, and punctuation carry a contemporary and updated tone. It is the language of a reporter, who reports the most recent ecological findings: "The Black Sea, we are told, is getting warmer, the Mediterranean colder" (16); "he asked, Isn't our prime minister at all

interested in knowing why?” When Freely’s translation is compared to Gün’s, the difference becomes clearer. Gün’s tone is prophetic, dark, and apocalyptic, as is the original: “The Black Sea is warming up, it turns out, as the Mediterranean cools down” (22); “[...] put to us this question: Does our prime minister give a damn?” (22). Following this opening question, in the rest of the chapter Celal gives his prediction of the disastrous future that awaits the Bosphorus, the city, and its citizens. He foresees a doomed future and a dried up Bosphorus, and at one moment, plunges into its tectonic layers to reveal what historical moments constitute its makeup.

Chapter 2 of the novel is heavily marked by the presence of the city of Istanbul and its landmark, the Bosphorus, and carries Freely’s nostalgic marks: “What is beyond doubt is that the heavenly place we once knew as the Bosphorus” (16). Pamuk’s nostalgic remarks about the city and its past give Freely opportunity to connect with her own past. This invisible connection between the translator and the city carries consequences for the translation. Freely’s Istanbul, especially in the second chapter of *The Black Book*, takes on a more positive and optimistic profile than it is in the original. The following example is a characteristic of how Pamuk writes and how Freely translates. Pamuk writes: “Sıcak bir yaz sonunda, *bu bataklık*ın, küçük bir kasabayı sulayan alçakgönüllü bir derenin tabanı gibi yer yer kuruyup çamurlaşacağını, hatta binlerce geniş borudan şelaleler gibi gürül gürül akan lağımın suladığı yamaçlarda otların ve papatyaların yeşereceğini tahmin etmek zor değil” (KK 23; emphasis mine). Freely translates, “But at the end of a hot summer, it’s not hard to imagine *this bog* drying up in some parts while remaining *muddy* in others, like the bed of a humble river that *waters a small town* in the middle of nowhere. Nor is it difficult to foresee daisies and green grass growing on slopes irrigated by thousands of *leaking sewage pipes*” (BB 17; emphasis mine). A comparison with Gün’s translation reveals the stark difference: “It isn’t hard to imagine that *this swamp*, after a hot

summer, will dry up in places and turn *mucky* like the bed of a modest stream that *irrigates a small town*, or even that the slopes of the basin fed abundantly by *gurgling sewage* that flows through thousands of huge tiles will go to daisies and weeds” (15; emphasis mine). Freely’s choice to cut Pamuk’s sentence into two and reorder it makes the picture clear which is not quite so in the original. Although her word choice of “this bog, muddy, waters a small town, leaking sewage” renders the meaning of Pamuk’s text, it does not capture the dark and prophetic tone of the original text. In the original novel, there is a stark difference between the tone employed in the first chapter and that in the second. They are rendered in two different registers, which, Freely’s translation does not capture. When Freely’s translation is compared to Gün’s, it becomes clear that Gün’s translation captures the tone and attitude of the original more successfully.

It is characteristic of their translations that Freely translates the title of the chapter “Boğazın Suları Çekildiği Zaman” as “*When the Bosphorus Dries Up*” and Gün as “*The Day the Bosphorus Dries Up*” (emphasis mine). As I discussed in more detail in my second chapter, Gün’s translation is suggestive of the day of the apocalypse in Judeo-Christian tradition. By recontextualizing the translation, she intends to establish identification between the English reader and Pamuk’s text. Freely’s choice of “When” in the title, renders the meaning of the original but leaves it devoid of context. The passage below is Celal’s darkest prediction in this chapter. Pamuk writes:

Ama asıl hazırlıklı olmamız gereken şey, bütün İstanbul’un koyu yeşil lağım şelaleleriyle sulanacağı bu lanet çukurda, tarih öncesinin yeraltından fokurdayan zehirli gazlar, kuruyan bataklıklar, yunus, kalkan ve kılıç leşleri ve yeni cennetlerini keşfeden fare orduları içerisinde çıkacak yepyeni bir salgın hastalığıdır. Biliyorum ve uyarıyorum: O

gün, dikenli tellerle karantinaya alınacak bu hastalıklı bölgede olup biten felaketler
hepimizin içine işleyecek. (KK 24)

Freely translates thus:

But that is not the worst of it, for in *this accursed cesspool* watered by the dark green
spray of every sewage pipe in Istanbul, we can be sure that *new epidemics* will break out
among the *armies of rats* as they explore their *new heaven*, this drying seabed strewn
with turbot and swordfish skeletons and polluted with the mysterious gases that have
been bubbling beneath the surface since long *before the birth of history*. This I know, and
this I must impress upon you: The authorities will seek to contain the epidemic behind
barbed wire, but it will touch us all. (17; emphasis mine)

Gün translates thus:

But what we must prepare ourselves for in this accursed *pit* fed by the waterfalls of all of
Istanbul's green sewage *is a new kind of plague* that will break out thanks to *hordes of*
rats who will have discovered a *paradise* among the gurgling *prehistoric underground*
gases, dried-up bogs, the carcasses of dolphins, the turbot, and the swordfish. Be
forewarned about what I know: the catastrophes that happen in this pestilent place
quarantined behind barbed wire will affect us all. (15; emphasis mine)

In comparing Pamuk's text and the two translations, Gün's translation stands out as a better
version of the original. Freely's opening, "But that is not the worst of it," softens the meaning of
Pamuk's "we have to be prepared for in this accursed pit fed by." Her translation is guided by
clarity, British and scientific vocabulary, and references to popular narratives. The word
"heaven" gives the passage a positive connotation. The British word "epidemic" carries scientific
and medical connotation. Even though it carries the meaning of something devastating, it is

conceivable and envisioned within human and scientific control. This meaning is reinforced by the word “authorities,” which suggest that the disaster is of controllable nature. When compared to Freely’s translation, Gün’s translation retains the sense of the original better.

Gün’s choice of the word “pit” is strategic in that her translation maintains the intertextual and metatextual aspects of the original. As early as this chapter, she begins to lay out the connections between the Bosphorus as a pit, to the pit in which Shams of Tebriz was found in *The Mesnevi*, an important intertext in *Kara Kitap*. This extends even to the airshaft in the family compound, which is a small replica of the Bosphorus, and where family members throw things they don’t use. She uses the word “pit” alternating with these images in order to strengthen the text’s intertextuality. The link between images and between *The Black Book* and other texts is completely lost in Freely’s translation. Gün’s “plague” functions on the levels of a literal and metaphorical disaster. The Latin word is one often used in Biblical translation and medieval texts. Freely’s “paradise” gives the text a positive connotation. The overall picture Freely paints is one of an ecological and controllable disaster, which is in stark contrast to Gün’s biblical disaster. In Freely’s version, Celal appears as a writer (“This I know”) who is sure of himself and of his predictions. Gün’s translation (“Be forewarned”), on the other hand, is prophetic and apocalyptic. Her choice of unusual phrases such as “prehistoric underground gases” and the passive voice (“the catastrophes that happen in this pestilent place”) suggests that the approaching disaster is a result of fate and powers beyond human control and conception. In particular, in the last sentence, Freely turns the passive into active and significantly elevates the power of “the authorities” to control the situation. Gün’s translation stands out as a more successful version since it approaches the original’s meaning, tone, and style better. “This I know, and this I must impress upon you” suggests journalistic urgency of reporting while “Be

forewarned about what I know” is a preface to and warning of a prophetic statement by an all-knowing demagogue. Gün’s translation, true to the original, is in passive voice, lacks a subject or an actor, and does not specify agency, thus adding to the apocalyptic and beyond the humans’ control imagery of her translation.

What follows is how Freely’s reordering of sentences and paragraphs brings a shift of attention from one imagery to another in the text. Although this could be understood as part of her overall agenda to render a clear text, shifting the sentences of the original in the translation results in an alternative focus. One of the most striking examples of this strategy is when Freely shifts the last sentence of a paragraph to the first sentence of the following paragraph. That is, the concluding sentence of a Pamuk paragraph becomes the introductory sentence of a Freely’s paragraph. Pamuk writes:

Kara Cadillac, bundan otuz yıl önce *ben*, bir acemi muhabirken serüvenlerini izlediğim ve patronu olduğu bir batakhanein girişindeki iki İstanbul resmine hayran olduğum bir Beyoğlu haydutunun (“gangster” demeye dilim varmıyor) caka arabasıydı. Arabanın İstanbul’da birer eşi o zamanların demiryolu zengini Dağdelen ile tütün kralı Maruf’ta vardı. Son saatlerini bir hafta tefrika ederek hikaye ettiğimiz ve *biz gazetecilerin* efsaneleştirdiği haydutumuz bir geceyarısı polis tarafından sıkıştırılınca, sevgiliyle *bir iddaya göre* esrar sarhoşluğundan, *bir iddiyaya göre de* bilerek atını uçuruma süren eşkıya gibi *Akıntı Burnu*’ndan Cadillac’ıyla birlikte Boğaz’ın karanlık sularına uçmuştu. Dalgıçların deniz dibi akıntısında günlerce arayıp bulamadıkları, *gazetelerin ve okuyucuların* da kısa bir süre sonra unuttukları Cadillac’ı nerede bulacağımı *ben* şimdiden kestirebiliyordum. (KK 25, emphasis mine)

Freely translates:

A night will come in this new hell when **I** slip through the barbed wire in search of a certain Black Cadillac. This Cadillac was the prize possession of a Beyoğlu bandit (**I** cannot bring myself to dignify him with the word *gangster*) whose exploits **I** followed some thirty years ago, when **I** was an apprentice reporter; **I** recall that in the entrance to the den of iniquity from which he ran his operations there were two paintings of Istanbul **I** greatly admired. There were only two other Cadillacs like it in Istanbul at the time, one owned by Dağdelen, who has made his fortune in highways, and the other by Maruf, the tobacco king. It could be said that we journalists were the ones who turned our bandit into an urban legend, for we recounted his last hours in a serial that ran for an entire week. The climax was a police chase that ended with the Cadillac leaving the road at Akıntı Point and flying into the black waters of the Bosphorus. According to some witnesses, the bandit was high in hashish; others claimed that he'd freely chosen death for himself and the mistress at his side, racing toward the point like a doomed highwayman driving his horse over a precipice. Divers spent days hunting for the Cadillac, to no avail. It wasn't long before the newspaper-reading public had forgotten it ever existed, but **I** have already pinpointed what **I** am certain will turn out to be its exact location. (18–19; emphasis mine, italics in the original)

Shifting the first sentence above results in a shift of focus. Freely's paragraph, as it stands, emphasizes Celal as a witness and his perspective as a journalist. The entire picture is framed by his point of view. It begins with his plunge into the depths of the Bosphorus and ends with his assertion of the certainty of what he knows. In addition, the repetition of the pronoun "I" in the English reinforces the point of view of the speaker/writer/narrator Celal and visually represents

the him in the text. By beginning the paragraph with the sentence, “A night will come... ” Freely brings attention to Celal’s phantasmagoric plunge into the depths of the Bosphorus and to what he finds there. In the last sentence, “I have already pinpointed” and “I am certain” brings the paragraph full circle by bringing the attention back to the narrator Celal. Her word choice of “we journalists,” “some witnesses,” and “the newspaper-reading public” reinforces the journalistic style of the passage. In addition, she makes “we journalists” the subject and renders it active. She cuts into two the last sentence. All of this is rendered with clear “objective” and “scientific” British English, which gives the entire passage an entirely different aura than the original. This is not surprising when one recalls that Freely is a journalist herself and a master of the style.

However, in the original, the paragraph begins with the second sentence and with attention to the black Cadillac. The sentence narrating Celal’s plunge into the Bosphorus concludes Pamuk’s previous paragraph, in which Celal predicts how the dark nature of a “new life” that would emerge from the lacuna of the dried-up Bosphorus after the waters totally recede would affect the citizens of Istanbul. It is at that specific moment that Celal would wish to plunge into that lacuna to uncover its layer. In the original, the new paragraph is exclusively focused on the haunting imagery of the “Black Cadillac.” That is, there is a clear shift of emphasis from the original to Freely’s translation. Gün’s translation follows the form of the original closely. Gün’s choice of past tense removes the text from the plane of reality, of the present, and of possibility. It gives it a mythical and archetypal flavor. Her vocabulary (“the patron of the den of iniquity,” “we serialized,” “us newsmen,” “like as a desperado,” “I can already figure out,” “the papers and the readers”) reinforces the story within the story and the fictional aspects of the narrative.

Especially, “according to some ... or else” closely mimics Pamuk’s intention to recreate the oral narrative in Turkish and the power of the hearsay.

As I discussed in Chapter 1, every even numbered chapter in the novel is Celal’s actual newspaper column. It is a positive coincidence that Freely is a journalists and the language of journalism is her strength. Her translation of the newspaper columns of the novel is successful in that she is better equipped with the language and style of journalism. She uses the opportunity of translating journalistic writing to take liberties and to comment on issues of interest to her, such as the city and its citizens. Gün’s translation is in line with her style of story- telling. She is more sensitive to the literary aspects of the original. Although formally she is faithful to the original and to its intertextual aspects, Freely’s translation of the newspaper columns recreates the journalistic style better. But then, Freely’s translation of the even numbered chapters where the story is narrated sounds like a newspaper report compared to the more nuanced translation of Gün’s. It is interesting to note that when asked what aspect of *The Black Book* was easiest to her to translate, Freely pointed out that it was the city of Istanbul and not the character of Celal and his masterful newspaper columns (Personal Interview). My close reading of Freely’s translation belies her comments in the Afterward that it was the “music” of the Turkish language and the goal to make the translation “clear” that were the guiding principles of the translation. As I demonstrate here, the translators’ styles and personal agendas as writers have a strong hold on how they translate.

Freely’s journalistic style and Gün’s literary style are revealed in the title of the second chapter as well as its opening line. Gün’s “The Day the Bosphorus Dries Up” puts a stress on “a day” and suggests the day of the Apocalypse. It recontextualizes the original and alludes to Judeo-Christian understanding of the Day of Judgment. Gün maintains the apocalyptic tone

throughout the chapter: “Are you aware that the Bosphorus is regressing? I doubt that you are” (14). Freely, on the other hand, assumes the tone and style of a newspaper reporter. She translates the title as “When the Bosphorus Dries Up” thus, emphasizing at what time, on what occasion, and in what circumstances. Her translation demonstrates a direct interest in the ecological aspects of the Bosphorus and the city. The difference in tone becomes clear when her opening sentence “Did you know that the Bosphorus is drying up? I don’t think so.” (16) is compared to Gün’s. Freely’s version is an obvious journalistic questioning addressed to a general public. She reports a possible ecological disaster. As I mentioned above, the journalese is Freely’s strength and she excels in the translation of Celal’s newspaper columns. The examples below demonstrate how Freely as a translator assumes the role of an editor and writer for a public journal.

Pamuk writes, “Karadeniz ısınıyor, Akdeniz soğuyormuş” (literally “It is said/narrated/reported that the Black Sea warms up while the Mediterranean cools down”; *KK* 23). Freely translates the sentence by inserting a clause of reporting: “The Black Sea, *we are told*, is getting warmer, the Mediterranean colder” (16). Another example is Pamuk’s “Boğaz kıyısında konuştuğumuz son balıkçılardan biri, eskiden demirlemek için bir minare boyu zincir attığı sularda şimdi teknesinin karaya oturduğunu söyleyerek sordu: Başbakanımız bu konuyla ilgileniyor mu? [break] Bilmiyorum.” (literally “One of the last remaining fishermen we talked to by the Bosphorus shore said that he used to throw an anchor as tall as a minaret into the same waters where now his boat is stuck on the ground and asked: Does our prime-minister show interest in that? I don’t know.” [*KK* 23]). Freely writes: “After one of the last remaining Bosphorus fishermen *told me* how his boat had run aground in a place where he had once had to throw in an anchor on a chain as long as a minaret, *he asked*, Isn’t our prime minister at all

interested in knowing why? [break] I didn't have an answer for him" (BB 16). The translator clearly assumes the role of the reporter when translating the passage above and renders an image in which Celal is the journalist/reporter and the fisherman a subject of his report. When Freely's translation is compared to Gün's version, the differences in style become more clear: "A fisherman we last interviewed on the shores of the Bosphorus, after describing how his boat went aground in the same deep waters where he once set anchor, *put to us this question*: Does our prime minister give a *damn*? [break] I don't know." (BB 15) Gün's translation reveals Celal's retelling the story of the fisherman who, by employing slang ("give a damn"), is stylistically and linguistically differentiated from the journalist. Gün's "I don't know" matches the original Celal's abruptness. As in the original, in Gün's translation, it is not clear whom Celal is addressing: the fisherman, the general public, us the readers, or Galip, who at that moment is reading the same column. Gün's translation retains the unstable and ambiguous narrative voice of the original. In Freely's translation, on the other hand, the narrative is even. Stylistically there is no difference between previous chapters and this one, and between Celal, the angry columnist-writer, and the simple fisherman.

What follows is an example of how Freely's reductive translation results in a more clear and positive picture of the Bosphorus. Pamuk writes:

Bildiğim giderek artan bir hızla ilerlediği açıklanan bu gelişmenin yakın gelecekteki sonuçlarıdır. Besbelli, kısa bir zaman sonra, bir zamanlar 'Boğaz' dediğimiz o cennet yer, kara bir çamurla sıvalı kalyon leşlerinin, parlak dişlerini gösteren hayaletler gibi parladığı bir zifiri bataklığa dönüşecek. Sıcak bir yaz sonunda ise, bu bataklığın, küçük bir kasabayı sulayan alçakgönüllü bir derenin tabanı gibi yer yer kuruyup çamurlaşacağını, hatta binlerce geniş borudan şelaleler gibi gürül gürül akan lağımaların suladığı

yamaçlarda otların ve papatyaların yeşereceğini tahmin etmek zor değil. Kız Kulesi'nin bir tepenin üstünde korkutucu gerçek bir kule gibi yükseleceği bu derin ve vahşi vadide yeni bir hayat başlayacak. (KK 23)

Freely translates:

All I know is that the water is drying up faster than ever, and soon no water will be left. What is beyond doubt is that *the heavenly place we once knew as the Bosphorus* will soon become a pitch-black bog, glistening with muddy shipwrecks baring their shiny teeth like ghosts. But at the end of a hot summer, it's not hard to imagine this bog drying up in some parts while remaining muddy in others, like the bed of a humble river that waters a small town in the middle of nowhere. Nor is it difficult to foresee daisies and green grass growing on slopes irrigated by thousands of leaking sewage pipes. Leander's Tower will at last become worthy of its name, terrifying us from its giddy heights; in the wild terrain beneath, a new life will begin. (BB 16-17; emphasis mine)

Gün's translation borrows biblical imagery, which turns the text into a more gruesome picture of an apocalyptic day:

All I know is the implications of this fast developing situation for the near future. Obviously, a short time from now, *the paradise we call the Bosphorus* will turn into a pitch-black swamp in which the mudcaked skeletons of galleons will gleam like the luminous teeth of ghosts. It isn't hard to imagine that this swamp, after a hot summer, will dry up in places and turn mucky like the bed of a modest stream that irrigates a small town, or even that the slopes of the basin fed abundantly by gurgling sewage that flows through thousands of huge tiles will go to daisies and weeds. A new life will begin in this

deep and wild valley in which the Tower of Leander will jut out like an actual and terrifying tower on the rock where it stands. (14-15; emphasis mine)

First of all, Freely's first sentence above is a very simplified free paraphrase version of Pamuk's complex sentence structure. Pamuk's "Bildiğim giderek artan bir hızla ilerlediği açıklanan bu gelişmenin yakın gelecekteki sonuçlarıdır" literally reads as "What I know is the near-future results of this accelerating process, as it has been announced." Indeed, Pamuk's sentence, with its extensive adjective phrase of "giderek artan bir hızla ilerlediği açıklanan bu gelişmenin yakın gelecekteki sonuçlarıdır" ("accelerating-ly increasing speed- proceeding- it has been announced —this development— near future-results") is extremely difficult to translate in English. Freely's "the heavenly place we once knew as the Bosphorus" is Freely's melancholic remark about the place she used to call home. Pamuk's "bir zamanlar 'Boğaz' dediğimiz o cennet yer" simply reads as "what we once used to call the Bosphorus, that heavenly place." Freely's "heavenly place" carries secular and worldly implications while Gün's "paradise" alludes to the Bible. The most striking difference is the way the two translators render Celal's most phantasmagoric imagery of the future dried up Bosphorus. According to Gün's prediction "mudcaked skeletons of galleons will gleam like the luminous teeth of ghosts" while according to Freely the Bosphorus will be "glistening with muddy shipwrecks baring their shiny teeth like ghosts." Gün's vocabulary is apocalyptic, creating a religious overtones, while Freely's word choice is more descriptive, creating overtones of a worldly and ecological catastrophe.

Avoiding transliteration is a strategy Freely employs consistently in her translation. This is difficult to explain because it clearly goes against her intention to retain the musicality of the original text. For English reader, Turkish names and original spellings are hard to pronounce and create a feeling of distance rather than identification. This domesticates the text and makes it fit

into the common understanding that Turkish novels, literature, and culture are distant and foreign. Some common examples of Freely's avoiding transliteration when there are obvious equivalents are these:

— “As for the *Istanbullus* who once lived on the edge of the water...” (18). “*Istanbullus*” means “citizens of Istanbul.”

— “vulgar American women looking for orgies in *hamams*” (36). “*hamams*” means “baths.”

— “luckless men downing *raki* and exchanging unhappy love stories in *meyhanes* on a winter's night” (40). “*meyhane*” means “dive” or “night club.”

— “behind his counter, piled to the ceiling with boxes and books, *Alaaddin* had been its witness... like houris from *The Thousand and One Nights*” (41-2). “*Alaaddin*” is the well-known character “Aladdin” in *The Nights*.

— “and turned his hands to writing lyrics for the sort of Turkish *saz* music one hears at memorials in smoky wedding halls” (78). “*saz*” means a “stringed instrument”

-- “Or else I am a messenger, sent out from the *medrese*, to awaken the drowsy dervishes of an outlawed order from years of silent sleep” (249). “*medrese*” means “seminary.”

Gün transliterates Celal as “Jelal” in a bold gesture and alludes to some of the well-known narratives of the western canon which is a gesture of domesticating the text. Yet she is careful not to domesticate the translation entirely. As I pointed out earlier, Freely's emotional attachment to the place and culture in which she grew up in 1960s has a strong impact on how she translates. Her attachment and melancholy explains why she retains words in Turkish when they have simple counterparts in English.

By way of concluding, a comparison of how Freely and Gün translated differently an early key passage in the novel is revealing. This passage is not only characteristic of the

differences of the two translations but also decisive as to how the two versions of the novel will be read and interpreted based on the two translations. The passage comes in chapter 5 of the novel, “Çocukluk Bu” which both translators render as “Perfectly Childish.” It is the chapter in which Galip remembers how Rüya, his run-away wife, used to do things. Pamuk writes:

Çağrışım [...]: Galip bir keresinde, Rüya’yı, yazarın da katilin kim olduğunu bilmediği bir polisiye romanın yazılırsa okunabileceğini söylerdi. Böylece, nesneler ve kahramanlar her şeyin farkında olan yazarın zoruyla ipuçları ve sahte ipuçları kisvesine bürünmeden, hiç olmazsa, polisiye yazarının hayallerini değil, hayatta oldukları şeyleri taklit ederek kitapta durabilirlerdi. Galip’ten daha iyi bir roman okuyucusu olan Rüya, böyle bir romanda ayrıntı bolluğuna nasıl bir sınır getirileceğini sormustu. Çünkü ayrıntılar bu romanlarda hep bir amaca işaret ederlermiş. (55)

Freely translates:

A memory [...]: Galip had once told Rüya that the only detective book he’d ever want to read would be the one in which not even the author knew the murderer’s identity. Instead of decorating the story with clues and red herrings, the author would be forced to come to grips with his characters and his subjects, and his characters would have a chance to become people in a book instead of just figments of their author’s imagination. Rüya, who knew more about detective novels than Galip did, asked how the author was to manage all that extra detail. Because every detail in a detective novel served a purpose. (50)

Gün translates:

Reminiscence [...]: Galip had once told Rüya that the only detective novel worth reading would be one in which the writer himself didn’t know the identity of the murderer. Only

then would the objects and the characters not turn into herrings and red herrings devised by the omniscient writer. By virtue of representing their correspondences in reality they would exist as themselves in the book, instead of as figments of the novelist's imagination. Rüya, who was a better reader of novels than Galip, had inquired how in the world the surfeit of details in such a novel as he proposed could be kept under control. The details in the detective novel were out there, apparently to foreshadow the outcome.

(44)

The passage above is one of the many instances in which the author comments on himself and on the book the reader is reading. In Freely's translation, this becomes clear. She uses the expression "detective book" and "detective novel" twice. She adds the explanatory subordinate clause "the author would be forced to come to grips with his characters and his subjects" and "would have a chance to become people in a book." She turns from passive into active "the author was to manage all that extra detail." All these revisions in the form of translation function to make the nebulous picture of Pamuk's novel obvious: this is a detective novel, characters are going to die at the end, and even the author himself does not know who the murderer is. The reader is supposed to read the novel for the details and not for the ending. This is why many of the book reviews of the new translation present a clear picture of the novel. More specifically, Jonathan Beckman, reviewing the new translation for *The Observer*, writes:

Early in this new translation of the work that brought Orhan Pamuk to international attention, Galip, the novel's protagonist, muses that 'the only detective book he'd ever want to read would be the one in which ... instead of decorating the story with clues and red herrings, the author would be forced to come to grips with his characters and his subjects'. While this

does not give an entirely comprehensive assessment, *The Black Book* is certainly, among other things, just such a detective novel. Everything has potential significance and the sleuth wanders deliriously through the streets of Istanbul desperately searching for meaning and drowning in a deluge of possible leads.

No review of Gün's translation presents a similar clear understanding of the novel. Most of the reviews present a skeptical understanding of it imbued in orientalizing assumptions. The more poetical Gün translation begins with "reminiscence," which is a clear allusion to Proust's *Remembrance of Things Past*, to which Pamuk alludes as well. Her choice to follow closely Pamuk's convoluted sentence structure retains the cloud over the passage. Although the same message is carried across, Gün's passage retains the conversational and contemplative aspect of the narrative. It is as if even the writer does not know where he is going. Instead of making a decision as early as chapter 6, he leaves his characters to contemplate it. Gün's remarkable ability to recreate the meaning and the nuanced stylistics of the original makes her translation a success.

Chapter 4: Ingrid Iren's *Das schwarze Buch* (1995)

Doch dieser Vorgang, das Über-Setzen von einem Sprachufer an das andere, das Hineinfühlen in eine andere Mentalität, sollte, weil zu umfangreich, in einem anderen Kontext behandelt werden.... Wenn sich nun dieses Denken, wie heute so oft, hauptsächlich auf ökonomische und technische Begriffe beschränkt, wird die Sprache in einem wesentlichen Bereich vernachlässigt, sie degeneriert, wird reduziert.... Ebenso gefährlich ist die Reduzierung der Sprache auf ein möglichst niedriges Niveau, um sie "verbraucherfreundlicher" zu machen. Kann man mit der Ni-vellierung, mit einer vereinfachten Ausdrucksweise wirklich einen neuen Leseanreiz zur Konkurrenz der wilden Bilderwelt erreichen, die uns umgibt? ... der Wandel, von dem auch die Literatur erfaßt wurde. Und gerade sie ist so wichtig für den Erhalt und die Weiterentwicklung von Sprache, Denken und letztlich Kultur.⁴⁵

—Ingrid Iren, "Sprache – Nährboden der Kultur"

Masumiyet Müzesi (*The Museum of Innocence*),⁴⁶ Orhan Pamuk's latest novel and the first to be published after the Nobel Prize, appeared in German translation⁴⁷ in October 2008 before it appeared in English⁴⁸. The precedence given to the German translation is a radical shift in the pattern of translations so far. All of Pamuk's earlier novels were translated into English before they were translated into other languages. In fact, English versions were often considered to be "official versions," which then served as the basis for translations into other languages. The priority given to the English language translations supports arguments that endorse the "world"

⁴⁵ The excerpt is from a lecture the translator Ingrid Iren presented at Marmara University-Istanbul, Turkey on November 15, 2008: "This endeavor, the act of translating from one language into another, should be taken as an introduction into another worldview, since it is to be understood in another context. ... When, as it so often happens now, (these) ideas are limited to economic and technical terms, language and its basic nature are neglected and reduced, it degenerates. ... Similarly dangerous is the reduction of language into a base level of making it 'consumer-friendly.' Is it really possible for human beings to compete with the widespread images that encircle us when the language capacity to express itself is thus reduced? ... the change from which literature is to follow. And in line with literature is also very important the preservation and further development of language, thinking, and lastly culture" (translation mine).

⁴⁶ Published in Turkey by İletişim Yayınları in 2008.

⁴⁷ *Das Museum der Unschuld* was translated into German by Gerhard Meier and published by Fischer Verlage.

⁴⁸ *Museum of Innocence* was translated into English by Maureen Freely and published by Alfred A. Knopf in 2009.

status of the English language.⁴⁹ However, the shift in the translation pattern in the case of *The Museum of Innocence* points to other factors that, operate in determining linguistic priorities when it comes to translation. Pamuk was the guest author of the Frankfurt Book Fair (Frankfurter Buchmesse) in 2009, which was the reason why the author and his agent insisted on the *rapid* translation of the novel into German. This is an ironic twist considering Ingrid Iren's thoughts regarding translation, language, and culture that open this chapter. This anecdote cautions us to discard any assumption of linguistic priority when it comes to translation from the so-called "minor languages" into European languages and calls for a closer look at the German translation of *Kara Kitap*, *Das schwarze Buch*.

Das schwarze Buch was translated from Turkish into German by Ingrid Iren and published in 1995 by Fisher in Germany. In this chapter, I argue that Iren performed a significant bridging role between the two languages and cultures through her active recreation of the Turkish narrative into German despite the pressure of the publisher and author for rapid translation. In contrast to the extremely limited translation publishing activity in the United States, Germany inherits and builds on an active translation history. Thus, German offers a very different context for studying translations than English does. Before I analyze the translation *Das schwarze Buch* in more detail, I provide a survey of the German translation tradition, a report on the latest trends in translation in Germany, and discussion on the state of Turkish literature in German translation.

Today, Germany is the country with the most translations in the world. However, translations from Turkish into German are not a large proportion of these titles. First examples of Turkish literature in German translation appear in 1912 when the German Orientalist and

⁴⁹ David Crystal's book *English as a Global Language* (1997) is one of these publications, which although seemingly objective, clearly favors English as a "World Language" and was published as a campaign book for U.S. English, Inc., an action group dedicated to preserving the unifying role of the English language in the United States.

translator Georg Rosen published *Tuti-Nameh, das Papageienbuch*, a translation and rewriting of the Turkish translation (“nach der türkischen Fassung übersetzt”) of Ziya al-Din Nakhshabi’s collection of tales.⁵⁰ Between 1912 and 1970s, translations from Turkish into German were sporadic,⁵¹ gaining momentum in 1970s with the arrival of Turkish “guest” workers in Germany. Especially, Yüksel Pazarkaya, a writer and translator, made significant contributions to the German language with his bi-lingual publications and translations⁵². Since the 1970s to the present, the Turkish residence in Germany has produced a vibrant contemporary literature to the extent that their impact came to be known as “German literature of Turkish migration” after the term coined by Leslie Adelson in her well-known and influential work on this subject. However, the history of this “turn” is rather complicated. Despite the undeniable presence of minorities, Germany does not consider itself a country of immigration. Although people of Turkish ethnicity have constituted the largest minority in Germany, for a long time, they have been excluded from rights to participate in everyday life, were discriminated against, and faced serious physical violence. They respond to and reimagine their precarious situation in literary and artistic production that reveals a variety of perspectives and aesthetic choices. These imaginative recreations provide us with alternative approaches to nation, migration, globalization, history, memory, multilingualism, and the formation of ethnic and cultural identity. The new literature that has emerged out of Turkish-German contact has increased the interest in Turkish literature

⁵⁰ *Tuti-Nameh*, literally “Tales of a Parrott,” is a 14th century Persian collection of stories. It came into German via its Turkish translation from a Hindi version of a Sanskrit text. This is another instance exemplifying the role of translation in cross-cultural and cross-linguistic exchange.

⁵¹ For exact titles and numbers see the bibliographical list of Turkish Literature in German Translation between 1912 and 2007: *Eine Bibliographie türkischer Literatur in deutscher Übersetzung: 1912 - 2007*, Zusammengestellt von Turgay Kurultay, İstanbul Üniversitesi, Çeviribilim Bölümü.

⁵² *Gedichte: Texte in zwei Sprachen türkisch-deutsch* is Pazarkaya’s translation of poetry by Behçet Necatigil. Pazarkaya was also the founder and the editor of the bilingual newspaper *Anadil (Mothertongue)* between 1980 and 1982.

and culture in Germany and has contributed to the increase of German translations of Turkish literature.

The German Translation Tradition: The Role of Translation in the Formation of the German Literary Canon

Translation has long played a significant role in the formation of German literature and culture. Beginning with Luther's translation of the Bible, Germans pioneered in the formation of the theory and practice of translation. In the English speaking world, this rich archive of German translation scholarship is represented by a limited number of scholars such as Walter Benjamin, Schlegel, and Schleiermacher. It is well-known that the political borders of the German-speaking world do not coincide with linguistic borders. While today *Hochdeutsch* is the official language used by Germans, Austrians, and (German-)Swiss, German literature paradoxically reflects both the common cultural heritage and the cultural plurality.

Translation was central to the transformation of German dialects rooted in oral pre-Christian tradition. The history of German translation goes back to the eighth century, known as the Old High German period. Between the eighth and tenth centuries, translation was exclusively from Latin religious and philosophical texts and was instrumental in establishing the written, literary language (Kittel 411-12). In the eleventh century, French influence began to be felt on Middle High German. The fifteenth and sixteenth centuries mark the gradual establishment of the common literary language. Martin Luther's Bible translation and other writings helped to establish a literary form of German that was oriented towards and modeled on the vernacular rather than on Latin. In the early modern High German period, translation concepts and principles were the center of discussions that climaxed in Luther's *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen*.

Translations of the fourteenth and early fifteenth century essentially fall into two classes. On the one hand, there were scholarly source text-oriented German translations which submitted to Latin norms; on the other hand, there were translations into German in its current written form, free from the constraints of Latin (Kittel 413). In his *Der Deutschen Poeterey* (1624), Martin Opitz (1597-1639), a German poet and thinker, spells out the characteristic tendency of translation in Germany during this period. He states that translation serves a dual purpose: translating from Greek and Latin poets is a good exercise for the translator and it benefits German as a literary language by enhancing its latent potential (quoted in Kittel 413). Translation from other languages and literatures served to enhance writers' poetic skills and was beneficial to the national literary canon.

The history of the German language since the middle ages is closely associated with translations of the Bible. Over a period of twelve hundred years these translations have formed a comprehensive corpus of texts, representative of the German translation culture and its development through the ages. Luther's translation, in particular, has had a formative and normative effect on modern High German. As Kittel and Poltermann note, the enormous success of Luther's Bible translation may be attributed to his creative use of the German vernacular and to his principles of translation, but also to the mass circulation of his writings, which was made possible by modern printing techniques, and to historical dynamics –religious, social, political, and economic –of the Reformation period (413). The Reformation, also, marked a turning point in the history of German Bible translation, with Luther and other protestant reformers reverting to source texts in Hebrew and Greek for their translations of the Old Testament and the New Testament.

The Modern High German Period is significant for the development of translation theory in German. The emergence of translation theory in Germany goes back to Johann Christopher Gottsched (1700-66) and the Leipzig circle, staunch defenders of Enlightenment values. Gottsched and his circle were opposed by the Swiss theoretical school represented by Johann Jakob Bodmer (1698-1783) and Johann Jakob Breitinger (1701-76). These two schools disagreed on the issue of whether translation should emulate linguistic, stylistic and formal features of the source text and thereby violate target-side norms. Gottsched maintained that a good translation had to be in agreement with the principles of Enlightenment normative poetics. The translator was duty-bound to improve, expand or abridge. The translation had to be a German text, through and through. Breitinger, in contrast argued that a translation must not violate the “thoughts” of the original or deviate from its source in any other way. The translations of Dante, Shakespeare, Rabelais, Ariosto, and Cervantes in this period belong to the same tradition and realize part of the Romantic project which aimed at accumulating world literature in the German language.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries when there was a shared belief in the inherent superiority of the French language and culture, there were also a large number of German imitations of French literary models and translations from French into German. German translators frequently used intermediate French translations as source texts, even when a copy in the original language was available (Kittel 414). When Germans realized the “distorting” effects caused by French mediation, they rejected French intellectual and cultural hegemony. The demise of French rationalism eventually led to an autonomous German national literature.

Known as a writer, literary editor, critic, and translator, Schlegel prepared the way for Romanticism in Germany. He was one of the first to reconcile the objective and subjective aspects of translation. He advocated fidelity to the source text, on the one hand, and creative

transformation and naturalization in accordance with target context requirements, on the other (Kittel 415). Schlegel's romantic concept of translation was systematically analyzed by Friedrich Schleiermacher. In his essay *Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens* originally published in 1813, Schleiermacher recognizes two methods for translation from a foreign language into German:

Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he [*sic*] leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the author towards him [*sic*]. The two roads are so completely separate from each other that one or the other must be followed as closely as possible, and that a highly unreliable result would proceed from any mixture so that it is to be feared that author and reader would not meet at all ... Whatever is said about translation following the letter and translation following the sense, faithful translation and free translation, and whatever other expressions may have gained currency; even though there are supposedly other methods, they must be reducible to the two methods mentioned above. (quoted in Biguenet and Schulte 36-55)

Schleiermacher's theory of translation is an either-or approach. Striking a balance between what might be a "free" or "faithful" translation is out of question. Either way, translation benefits the reader or the national literature by educating the reader or by introducing a novelty to the literature. Significant to note is that Schleiermacher sees the translator as the arbitrator of the distance that needs to be traversed either by the author and the reader in act of reading a translation.

Translation of non-European languages into German only began in the 19th century; the majority of translations continued to be of texts in the Romance languages, especially French,

and increasingly English sources (Kittel 415). During World War I and II, translation activities decreased due to the unavailability of source texts and politically motivated censorship. This applies to the occupied zones of Germany in the immediate postwar period and it continued in the German Democratic Republic until 1988. Nevertheless, the *Index translationum* (UNESCO international bibliography of translations) of 1986 shows that nearly as many books were translated and published in East Germany (794) as in Great Britain (904). By comparison, 1,687 translated books appeared in France and 8,017 in the Federal Republic of Germany. In divided Germany, the opposed ideologies, political and economic systems, and military alliances of the two German states had an effect on what texts were chosen for translation and on the manner of translation.

Starting with the Renaissance and going through the twentieth century, German theorists and translation practitioners often addressed the problem of literary translation. When put in a chronological order, these statements coalesce into a tradition. In his book *Translating Literature: The German Tradition*, Andre Lefevere argues that certain statements can only be understood if they are related to the intellectual milieu in which they originated (1). Within this tradition, essays such as Benjamin's "The Task of the Translator" ("Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers"), which has often been as groundbreaking for translation studies in the Anglo-Saxon world, is much less novel compared to statements by Johann J. Bodmer and Friedrich Schlegel. In the history of German translation theory, Martin Luther and Justus Georg Schottel are considered to be the precursors of the tradition. They were followed by pioneers including Justus Georg Schottel, who was oriented to French ideals; Johann Jakob Bodmer, Johann Jakob Breitinger, and Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, who looked up to literature in English; and Johann Gottfried Herder, who was polemically oriented to the German past. Masters such as Goethe,

Humboldt, and Schleiermacher, are still central to the theory of literary translation. Benjamin and Rosenzweig come much later and should be seen as the disciples of this tradition.

This brief survey shows that translation has long played a significant role in the formation of German literature. Translation activity has long been seen as a way of improving the German language and enriching the German culture. Early translation theories are evaluative as they tend to prescribe what “good” and “bad” translation is and what methods lead to “good” translation. Later on, writing about translation turns into writing about language in general. Translation is seen as part of everyday language activities. As translation acquires different functions, it also generates internal criticism. While Schleiermacher’s theory of the two most common translation approaches is the best known (as exemplified in his essay “Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens”), Benjamin’s critique of dominant approaches to translation in Germany⁵³ in his essay “Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers” is the most significant.

As of eighteenth century, eminent authors like Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Johann Gottfried Herder, and Rainer Maria Rilke established the German literary scene as one open to texts from other languages, and this continues today. Inheriting the tradition of producing translations, some of Germany’s best writers have taken up the challenge of translating works of literature, of essentially rewriting others’ books to bring them to a wider audience. For instance, Paul Celan has translated from seven languages into German, Peter Handke has translated Shakespeare and Walter Percy among others, Hans Magnus Enzensberger has translated poems by various authors and works by Federico Garcia Lorca, and Nobel Prize Winner Elfriede

⁵³ In this essay, Benjamin gives voice to Rudolph Pannwitz’s comments regarding mainstream translation practices in Germany: “Our translators, even the best ones, proceed from a wrong premise. They want to turn Hindi, Greek, English into German instead of turning German into Hindi, Greek, English. Our translators have a far greater reverence for the usage of their own language than for the spirit of the foreign works... The basic error of the translator is that he [*sic*] preserves the state in which his [*sic*] own language happens to be instead of allowing his language to be powerfully affected by the foreign tongue” (Rudolph Pannwitz quoted in Benjamin, “The Task of the Translator,” in Venuti’s *The Translation Studies Reader*, 2000: pp. 75-85).

Jelinek has translated Thomas Pynchon. W. G. Sebald, not a translator himself but a staunch promoter of German literature in the English-speaking world, founded the British Center for Literary Translation.

Emerging new-generation German writers follow on this legacy. Acclaimed young author Antje Strubel has earned a solid reputation as a translator for her work on *The Year of Magical Thinking* by Joan Didion, as did the winner of the Ingeborg Bachmann Prize Terezia Mora, for her translation of Peter Esterhazy. The German poet Ulrike Draesner translates professionally. Ralf Dutli first came to be known as Ossip Mandelstam's translator into German. In the field of popular fiction, a bestselling-author of historical fiction, who writes under her pseudonym Rebecca Gable, uses her real name Ingrid Krane-Müschen to translate books by authors like Elizabeth George and Patricia Shaw. It is also important to note that there are German publishers, such as Michael Krüger of *Hansen Verlag*, Alexander Fest from *Rowohlt Verlag*, and Joachim Unseld of *Frankfurter Verlagsanstalt*, who have also translated books or poems.

To turn to translation theory, since the World War II, two main streams have developed in the German-speaking world. One is the linguistically oriented *Übersetzungswissenschaft*⁵⁴ and the other is the culturally oriented approach.⁵⁵ Scientific rigor within the field of translation came after World War II along with the development of machine translation in the early 1950s. This development was meant to replace the “hazy speculations” of literary approaches. The most important proponent of this approach was Eugene Nida, who proposed the “science of translation.”⁵⁶ As a subdiscipline of applied linguistics, this branch of translation studies adopted strictly scientific aims and methods. Within this approach, translation was viewed literally as

⁵⁴ For a detailed study of this approach, see Wills.

⁵⁵ This approach is well represented by Hans J. Vermeer's *skopos* theory (in Venuti *Translation Studies Reader* 221-232). For a detailed study of the cultural turn in German translation studies see Mary Snell-Hornby's edited volume *Übersetzungswissenschaft-Eine Neuorientierung. Zur Integrierung von Theorie und Praxis* (1986).

⁵⁶ See Nida's *Towards a Science of Translating* (1964).

linguistic transcoding.⁵⁷ The concept of equivalence was central to this translation theory. It is, however, a highly controversial concept, and despite heated debates over the ensuing decades, it has never been satisfactorily defined in relation to translation.

As Mary Snell-Hornby has discussed in her essay “Übersetzen, Sprache, Kultur,” the English term “equivalence” and the German term “Äquivalenz” do not denote the same thing (*Übersetzungswissenschaft* 13-16). The concept of “Äquivalenz” was used as a strictly scientific term and proved more suitable at the level of individual words than at the level of the entire text to be translated. It was assumed that this approach supplied “potential equivalents” from which the translator selected the “optimal equivalent” for the case in question. Gradually, it was realized that translation involves more than a loose sequence of individual words and the concept of “translation unit” was developed as a basis for a scientific approach to translation. Eventually, this understanding gave way to the view that the only possible basis for comparison in translation was the complete text (Reiss 11-12). Although there has been a crucial shift of focus from the isolated lexical items to different handlings of texts in the process of translation, this approach largely remains within the limits and frames of linguistics.

Other German studies on translation engage with cultural rather than linguistic aspects of the transfer. These studies view translation as an act of communication and study the function of the target text (Reiss and Vermeer, Snell-Hornby).⁵⁸ Hans J. Vermeer’s *Skopostheorie*, which highlights the importance of the function of the target text, is the most important contribution to the cultural approach to translation studies in Germany. According to this theory, the target text fulfills different functions in different contexts and changes according to the needs of the target culture (Reiss and Vermeer 36). This observation implies that the perfect translation does not

⁵⁷ For a rigorous linguistic definition of translation see Koller, *Grundprobleme* (69-70).

⁵⁸ For an alternative definition to *Übersetzungswissenschaft* approach, see Vermeer’s essay “Übersetzen als kultureller Transfer” in Snell-Hornby *Übersetzungswissenschaft* (33).

exist and is always relative to the given situation. Vermeer's theory brings German translation studies close to the "cultural turn" in translation studies. Yet, it still remains limited to the study of pragmatic texts rather than literary texts. Vermeer's theory is taught in training institutions, which do not particularly cater to literary translators. Literary translation in Germany is considered to be part of *Komparatistik* and is in the domain of literature departments.

In the last several decades, thus, linguistic and literary approaches to translation have been mutually exclusive in Germany. In the linguistically oriented *Übersetzungswissenschaft*, literary translation was explicitly ruled out as being free play with creative and expressive elements in language and beyond any scientific objectivity (Wilss *Übersetzungswissenschaft* 181). Conversely, scholars in literary translation reject the linguistic approach as useless for their purposes (Hermans, *The Manipulation* 10). The culturally oriented approach to translation theory has potential for bridging the gap. Further, its orientation towards the target text as part of the target culture coincides with the approaches to literary translation in other schools. It has to be pointed out, however, that Vermeer's cultural approach is still very pragmatic and does not address the factor of style, which is extremely important in literary translation. On the other hand, scholars like Mary Snell-Hornby propose an integrated approach in order for translation studies to establish itself as an independent discipline, rather than as two separate subdisciplines of the two different subject areas of applied linguistics and literary criticism (Snell-Hornby 1988). Today, the rigorous linguistic conception of translation as mere substitution or transcoding has been largely abandoned whereas the potential in the culturally oriented approach has yet to be expanded.

The State of Translation in Germany

German is spoken mostly in Europe and mainly in Germany, Austria, and the German-speaking parts of Switzerland. In terms of native speakers, German surpasses every other language in the European continent, apart from Russian (95 million in Europe, 120 million worldwide). It is the mother tongue for approximately 24percent of the EU's citizens.⁵⁹

According to Bundesagentur für Aussenwirtschaft (The Office for Foreign Trade), Germany has a population of 82.5 million.⁶⁰ In Germany, the year 2005 saw 89,869 new published titles and an estimated resulting revenue of 9.16 billion Euros. In this country, reading is ranked eighth as a leisure activity.⁶¹ Approximately 500 million volumes are printed each year, which averages out to about 6.5 books per German per year.⁶² Germany is the country with the most translations in the world.⁶³ In 2005, 6,132 translations were published, a 13,4percent increase over 2004. Translations, however, make up only 7.9percent of all new titles. In 2004, this number was 7.3percent, compared with 1995, when translations were around 14.2percent. These statistics reveal that the impact of translation has drastically declined in the past ten years.

The ascendance of the English language worldwide has also influenced the German publishing industry. More than 60 percent of all translated titles in 2005 came from English. In 2004, this figure was at 56.8 percent. French is the second-most translated language albeit far behind English at only 9.4percent. At a rate of 25.1percent, fiction makes up the largest share of translations. In 2004, however, this number was much higher at 40.5percent. In total, 13.8percent of all fiction titles are translations. The role played by translations in fiction

⁵⁹ Goethe-Institute, <http://www.goethe.de>; EUROPA, <http://www.europa.eu>.

⁶⁰ Bfai-Bundesagentur für Aussenwirtschaft, <http://www.Bfai.de>.

⁶¹ Verbraucheranalyse/Consumer Statistics 2004, Bauer Media AG: <http://Bauermedia.com>.

⁶² Börsenverein des Deutschen Buchhandels, <http://www.boersenverein.de>.

⁶³ Becker, Jürgen J. "Übersetzung." *Das BuchMarktBuch*. Ed.by E. Schuetz. Der Literaturbetrieb in Grundbegriffen. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Enzyklopaedie im Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, 2005.

publishing has diminished due to compensation disagreements between publishers and literary translators. For publishers, translation involves a certain amount of risk in terms of profit and sales while for literary translators the royalty question is still unresolved. That is, compared to early translation history in Germany, today translation activity, quality, and prestige has declined in this country.

Since the 18th century, Germany has been a classic example of an ideal destination for translated works (Becker 312). The above cited statistics show that Germans are aware that there would not be an international community without translation and translators. Translations into German also have enabled some Eastern European writers to gain attention in the rest of the world. For instance, the Hungarian writer Imre Kertesz would not have received the Nobel Prize were it not for the German translations, which gave other countries access to his work.

Translation plays an important role in the literary culture of Germany. Thus, bookstores and large chains stock and display translations. Magazines and newspapers promote translation by regularly featuring and reviewing the latest titles. The list of the top 100 all-time favorite books consists mainly of foreign titles, with the top-ten being dominated by English language books.⁶⁴ Yet, the atmosphere of the 1990s, when German publishers outbid each other and paid outrageously large amounts of money in order to secure the rights to a new John Grisham or lesser known American author, is over. In 2000, English titles accounted for 72 percent of new titles. By 2005 that figure dropped to 61 percent. Reasons for this decrease lay in the difficulty of making profit when paying such large amounts in advance, and the overall drop in book sales in Germany. To make up for this, Germans have instead looked for and invested in publishing new German writers. As a result, the role of German-language writers has increased. Books by

⁶⁴ See Megan Harris's "Foreign Books Dominate German Market" in <http://DW-WORLD.DE>, <http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,2144,1726488,00.html> (1 May 2010).

German young authors are selling better and closely with young American writers. Now, between 30 percent and 60 percent of the fiction bestseller list are books by English-speaking authors and about the same amount, around 30 percent to 50 percent are books by German authors. The remaining 10 percent to 25 percent are translations from other languages.⁶⁵ The German publishing community and many cultural organizations organize internationally oriented events and promote literature from abroad to help increase the number of foreign titles that enter the German book market, with special interest more recently on literature from Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Eastern Europe.⁶⁶

Currently, publishers and translators are engaged in a debate over the imbalance regarding the required training for translators and the compensation they receive from publishing houses. The average literary translator does not earn enough money to make a living. They hardly make 15 to 20 Euros per page gross with an average of 100 pages translated per month.⁶⁷ Former German president Roman Herzog confirmed this when he said: “Daß man mit einem der wichtigsten Berufe, die unser Geistesleben kennt, seinen Lebensunterhalt in der Regel nicht bestreiten kann, ist im Grunde skandalös” (It is fundamentally outrageous that a person with one of the most important jobs in today’s cultural life cannot make a living).⁶⁸

In an attempt to improve the situation for literary translators, a lawsuit was filed against publishers on behalf of translators. Translators are claiming a share of the sales earnings from the books they translate, a share they claim they are entitled to regardless of the edition of the book.

⁶⁵ See Börsenblatt des Deutschen Buchhandels, #27-2006, p.191; #28-2006, p.153; #29-2006, p.167; #36-2006, p.137; #38-2006, p.151; #42-2006, p.155; #43-2006, p.139.

⁶⁶ Deutscher Kulturland International: <http://www.deutsche-kultur-international.de/search/index.html?keyword=146§ion=search&lang=de>.

⁶⁷ See Eva Kuhn, “Arbeit im Verborgenen,” in <http://www.zdf.de/ZDFde/inhalt/4,01872,2194692,00html> (1 May 2010).

⁶⁸ See Roman Herzog, “Rede anlässlich des Wieland-Übersetzerpreis,” <http://www.fim.musin.de/Cyberlernen/gabi2/Rede.html> (1 May 2010).

In the past, publishers granted translators a share of the sales profits only in cases where the book was a bestseller. Translators achieved a small victory when the district court in Munich decided that in addition to the initial compensation for translating a book, translators were entitled to a certain percentage of sales earnings starting with the first copy sold. This share ranges between 0.5 and 2 percent.⁶⁹ Publishers criticized this court decision, saying this will decrease the resources available to publish other books. However, the ongoing public discussion shows that translators are becoming recognized and their overall situation has improved as they have become more visible: their names are on the covers and biographies on the inside covers of the books they translate.

Today Germany ensures the flow of international literature into the German language through two different kinds of translation funding: grants for publishers and grants for individual translations. For translations into German, there are organizations and ministries of culture located in the countries in which the title to be translated originated.⁷⁰ These institutions and programs promote the translation of culturally informative literature from various regions of the world into German in order to enhance cultural understanding of societies that often receive little national and international attention. Noteworthy is the Literarisches Colloquium Berlin (LCB), which has substantial influence in the field of translation.⁷¹ The LCB promotes German literature, administers both writer- and translator-in-residence programs, and serves as a center and facilitator for translators. One of their programs offers a translation grant for publishers interested in fiction from Central and Eastern Europe. It aims to diversify the selection of books available to German readers by giving lesser-known books a better chance of being read. In

⁶⁹ See Schermer-Rauwolf, Gerlinde, "Friß oder Stirb." <http://www.literaturuebersetzer.de>.

⁷⁰ For example, IreCompany Literature Exchange, the Finnish Literature Information Center (FILI) in Finland, Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Literatur aus Afrika, Asien und Lateinamerika e. V. (Society for the Promotion of Literature from Africa, Asia, and Latin America).

⁷¹ See LCB: <http://lcb.de>.

addition to programs available for publishers, there are organizations that help give translators a voice within the literary sphere of Germany, Switzerland, and Austria.⁷²

In contrast to the extremely limited translation publishing activity in the United States, Germany inherits and builds on an active translation history. The readership in Germany demonstrates openness to and interest in international publishing, which reaches Germany mostly through translation. Although interest in translation from Turkish into German is not a top priority, after the Nobel Prize the rapid translation of Pamuk's works into German has opened the door for further translation and intercultural communication.

Turkish Literature in German Translation: Unionsverlag-Zürich and the "Turkish Literature in 20 Volumes Series" Project

With over two million residents, Turks in Germany constitute the largest national and ethnic minority today. Writers and poets such as Emine Sevgi Özdamar (*Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn, Mutterzunge: Erzählungen, Das Leben ist eine Karawanserei hat zwei Türen aus einer kam ich rein aus der anderen ging ich raus, Der Hof im Spiegel: Erzählungen*), Zafer Şenocak (*Gefährliche Verwandtschaft*), Feridun Zaimoglu (*Kanak Sprak*), Aras Ören (*Bitte nix Polizei: Kriminalerzählung*), and Levent Aktoprak (*Entwicklung, Unterm Arm die Odyssee, Das Meer noch immer im Kopf*), represent the vibrant area of contemporary literature in Germany written by authors of Turkish background. Scholars and critics such as Leslie Adelson⁷³, Kader

⁷² See Verband deutschsprachiger Übersetzer (VdÜ) literarischer und wissenschaftlicher Werke eV: <http://literaturuebersetzer.de>; Deutscher Übersetzerfonds (German Translators Fund) (DÜF); as well as Frankfurt Book Fair, Deutsche Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung, Deutscher Literaturfonds e.V., Europäisches Übersetzer-Kollegium Nordrhein-Westfalen in Straelen e.V., and Dialogwerkstatt Zug offer fellowships, translation prizes, and exchange programs to translators.

⁷³ Adelson's *The Turkish Turn in Contemporary German Literature* (2005) is an inquiry into the possible analytical framework and context in which the then emerging "literature of Turkish migration" could be studied and understood. Adelson discusses in depth writings by Aras Ören, Emine Sevgi Özdamar, Zafer Şenocak, and Feridun Zaimoğlu. Although I find her heuristic device of "the concept of *touching tales*" (emphasis in the original, 20) somewhat simple in addressing configurations of "German guilt, shame, or resentment about the Nazi past, German

Konuk⁷⁴, Azade Seyhan⁷⁵, and Yasemin Yildiz⁷⁶ have written about the literary innovations introduced into the German literary scene by writers of Turkish ethnicity and writing in the German language.⁷⁷ Thanks to these scholars, our understanding of the so-called *Gastarbeiterliteratur* has come a long way since the early misconception of this body of works as marginal, exclusive, and limited. The substantial and highly complex corpus of Turkish-German literature has transformed the simplistic and stereotypical conception of immigrants' and guestworkers' linguistic capabilities as deficient. Rather, scholars of Turkish-German literature have identified the ingenuity and creativity of writers of this corpus in dealing with a foreign language environment as a stark alternative to the paradigm of deficiency connoted by negative stereotypes. Despite a long history of exclusion and the media's negative depiction and disastrous representation of immigrants and "foreign guest workers," German literature written by writers of Turkish background has contributed significantly to the mutual understanding and communication across assumed and essentialized national and cultural divides.

The most recent events in the field of translation publishing from Turkish into German attest to these positive developments. In 2005, Unionsverlag-Zürich initiated a major translation project, *Die Türkische Bibliothek*, devoted to introducing to the German readership the literary

fears of migration, Turkish fears of victimization, national taboos in both countries, and Turkish perceptions of German fantasies" (20), overall her book is a rich document of research into Turkish-German literature and a bold intervention into the theories of migration, diaspora, memory, and transnational literature.

⁷⁴ Konuk's book, *Identitäten im Prozeß* (2001) devotes an entire chapter to the writings of Emine Sevgi Özdamar (pp.83-125).

⁷⁵ Seyhan's book *Writing Outside the Nation* (2001) discusses in detail Emine Sevgi Özdamar's writings in comparison to other transnational writers (pp. 141-50, 101-2, 117-24).

⁷⁶ Yasemin Yildiz's book, *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition* (Fordham University Press, 2012) devotes chapters to Emine Sevgi Özdamar (pp. 143-168) and Feridun Zaimoğlu (pp.169-202).

⁷⁷ Adelson calls this literature "German literature of Turkish migration." Early on, Azade Seyhan investigated the impacts of this literary innovation under the designation "transnational writers whose mastery of their literary language is not a result of colonial experience but of migration and resettlement." Yasemin Yildiz uses the terms "Turkish migrants' literature in German." Venkat Mani calls it "Turkish-German literature." Since the 1980s, many German scholars referred to the same body of works as "guest worker literature," "foreigners' literature," or "migrants' literature," thus reinstating negative stereotyping, negative connotation, and exclusion from the German literary cannon.

output in Turkish.⁷⁸ The belated nature of this project is striking given the strong tradition of translation in Germany and the extended presence of Turks in Germany. In this context, Unionsverlag's translational initiative is a milestone.

Since 2005, under the title "The Turkish Library" and in a 20-volume collection, Unionsverlag has been exclusively publishing translations of modern Turkish literature. The initiative is supported by the Robert Bosch Foundation-Stuttgart and the collection is edited by Erika Glassen and Jens-Peter Laut. The aim of the project is to introduce German-speaking readers to the cultural and intellectual world of modern Turkey. The collection ranges from novels, autobiographies, traditional narratives, modern short stories, and poetry to literary as well as cultural-historical essays – all translated into German for the first time. The collection includes classic early 20th century novels that have become mainstays of Turkish literature as well as recent works by contemporary Turkish authors. Each work is meant to represent and reflect, both diachronically and synchronically, the diversity of Turkish literature and the wealth of lifestyles and mindsets within Turkish society. The catalogue of the project reveals that the literary works in this collection are meant to illustrate Turkey's social, political, and cultural development from the end of Ottoman rule to the most recent developments with negotiations for accession to the European Union.

It is significant that one of the objectives of the "Turkish Library in German" is to bring authors and artists in contact with the German-speaking readership, which includes second- and third-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, who know more about Germany and how Germany imagines Turkey and its people than they know about the realities of Turkey and its literature. Each new publication has been supported by public readings

⁷⁸ <http://www.unionsverlag.com/info/tbdefault.asp>.

in several cities, discussion forums, and various cultural activities. In addition, teaching materials have been published to help teachers incorporate the Turkish Library into their classrooms.

The Robert Bosch Foundation is one of the major German foundations associated with a private company. Its mission is to take on challenges of modern day society by developing forward-looking concepts and putting them into practice. With this project, the Foundation strives to enhance an equal dialogue between Germans and Turks. It is a sign that Germany has begun to consider Turkey its European neighbor. The importance of this project becomes more pertinent when one considers the close historical ties between the two countries and the presence of 2.5 million Turkish immigrants in Germany. In its focus area “German-Turkish Relations,” the Robert Bosch Foundation asks significant such as “Do we really know each other? How can we capitalize on our special historical relationship for our common future? What can be done to broaden our view on Turkey?”⁷⁹ These questions and concerns suggest that the Foundation sees translation as a means to a better mutual understanding between German and Turkish people.

Unionsverlag-Zürich has already published classic and contemporary novels,⁸⁰ many of which have not been translated into English yet. Beside the systematic publishing of literature translated from Turkish into German, Unionsverlag published edited volumes and anthologies

⁷⁹ <http://www.bosch-stiftung.de/content/language2/html/435.asp>.

⁸⁰ For example, Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil's *Aşk Memnu* (1900; *Verbotene Liebe*, translated into German by Wolfgang Riemann), Memduh Şevket Esendal's *Ayaşlı ve Kiracıları* (1934; *Herr Ayaşlı und seine Mieter*, translated into German by Carl Kofi), Sabahattin Ali's *İçimizdeki Şeytan* (1940; *Der Dämon in uns*, translated into German by Ute Birgi-Knellessen), Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's *Huzur* (1949; *Seelenruhe*, translated into German by Christoph K. Neumann), Yusuf Atılgan's *Aylak Adam* (1959; *Der Müßiggänger*, translated into German by Antje Bauer), Leyla Erbil's *Tuhaf Bir Kadın* (1971; *Eine seltsame Frau*, translated into German by Angelika Gilliz-Acar and Angelica Hoch), Adalet Ağaoğlu's *Ölmeye Yatmak* (1973; *Sich hinlegen und sterben*, translated into German by Ingrid Iren), and Oğuz Atay's *Bir Bilim Adamının Romanı* (1973; *Der Mathematiker*, translated into German by Monica Carbe); contemporary novels such as Murathan Mungan's *Doğu Sarayı* (1996; *Palast des Ostens*, translated by Birgit Linde and Alex Bischof), Hasan Ali Toptaş's *Gölgesizler* (2002; *Die Schattenlosen* translated into German by Gerhard Meier), Aslı Erdoğan's *Kırmızı Pelerinli Kent* (2002; *Die Stadt mit der roten Pelerine*, translated into German by Angelika Gilliz-Acar and Angelica Hoch), and Ahmet Ümit's *Sis ve Gece* (1996; *Nacht und Nebel*, translated into German by Wolfgang Scharlipp).

such as *Kultgedichte* edited by Erika Glassen and Turgay Fişekçi, a unique bilingual anthology of poetry, accompanied by short essays written by various representatives of culture and Politics; *Von Istanbul nach Hakkari – Eine Rundreise in Geschichten*, edited by Tevfik Turan, a literary journey through the diversity of the Anatolian peoples, lifestyles, and landscapes in more than 30 narratives by renowned Turkish authors; and *Liebe, Lügen und Gespenster*, edited by Börte Sagaster, contemporary stories in a variety of genres, representations of the younger generation's new ways, and perspectives to deal with the challenges of modern Turkish society.

In addition to this major translation project, Beatrix and Mesut Caner's small publishing house, Verlag Literaturca, in Frankfurt am Main, supplies readers with a wide variety of contemporary works in translation.⁸¹ The press has published novels by Bilge Karasu, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, Demir Özlü, Feyza Hepçilingirler, Erendiz Atasü, Pinar Kür, Elif Şafak, Cemal Kavukçu, Ayla Kutlu, Tomris Uyar, Murat Gülsoy, Y.D. Bengi, and Ahmet Haşım. Another publishing house, the J&D Dağyeli Verlag in Berlin, has dedicated itself to the publishing of literary works by Turkic people.⁸² Representative authors catalogued by this press are Anar, Ahmed Arif, Nalan Barbarosoğlu, Asım Beşirci, Mevlüt Bozdemir, Yıldırım Dağyeli, Yunus Emre, Nazım Hikmet, Orhan Veli Kanık, Rumi, and Demir Özlü among others.

In Germany, the contemporary scene of translation publishing, and especially that of translations from Turkish into German, reveals active involvement in cross-cultural understanding through translation that is in sharp contrast to the almost nonexistent publishing activity from Turkish into English.

⁸¹ <http://www.literaturca.de>.

⁸² <http://www.dagyeliverlag.de>.

Turkish Literature in Germany: A Study in Reception

Since Pamuk received the Nobel Prize in Literature in 2006, there has been an increase in interest in Turkish literature in general and in Pamuk's works in particular both among the general public and literary scholars. This positive development culminated in 2008 when Turkey was the guest country of the Frankfurt Book Festival and Orhan Pamuk the guest author. This interest marks a radical turn in German-Turkish cultural relations, which, as I mentioned above, have been uneasy for a long time. Until recently, Turks have been most unfavorably represented in the media.⁸³ They have been tied to an image of linguistically incompetent migrant workers and have been represented as linguistically deficient and mute characters in literature, drama, and cinema. Their creative works have been segregated from the canon, labeled in ways that prevent their entry into the national and world literary scene, as *Gastarbeiterliteratur* (guest worker literature), *Ausländerliteratur* (foreigner literature), or *Migrantenliteratur* (migrant literature), and treated in special editions. Turks have been an indecipherable silent presence in Germany. The Nobel to Pamuk seems to have altered this status.

It should be noted that although interest in Pamuk's works is a favorable development, it would be limiting to say that Pamuk represents the entirety of Turkish letters and interest in his works is sufficient for cross-cultural understanding. Pamuk's prominence in Germany has not altered some orientalist conceptions regarding the author, the literature he represents, and the city he comes from and writers about. This situation is the outcome of the legacy of assumed German superiority, which came to understand the Turkish culture through limited frameworks such as the *Gastarbeiterliteratur*. Even though sympathetic German academics like Irmgard Ackermann⁸⁴

⁸³ Germany's leading weekly news magazine captured the general tendency by calling German Turks "icons of the foreign" ("Weder Heimat noch Freunde," *Der Spiegel* (23 June 1993): A7, 16–27).

⁸⁴ Ackermann calls this body of works "an independent literary form" in "'Gastarbeiter' literatur als Herausforderung," *Frankfurter Hefte* 38 (1983): 56.

and Harald Weinrich⁸⁵ employed various strategies to both legitimize and to disarm the literature of the “gastarbeiter” by incorporating it within the German tradition, they could not free themselves from the position of the superior German scholar studying a “lower order” and a “marginal” literary tradition. As Arlene Akiko Teraoka, who has studied orientalist scholarship in the German context, writes, “The Orientals, who have maintained their intimate, 'original' connection to an oral tradition of storytelling, are contrasted with the technologically advanced, rational, and scientific Germans who 'distill' their knowledge through logical argumentation—the prejudicial stereotype of self and Other” (99). That is, the paradigm of comparing literary works in terms of “ours” and “theirs” (historically and geographically) or judging them by elusive and unstable yardsticks such as polished versus crude, native versus advanced, is still very prominent even in the works of sympathetic and sensitive scholars. This approach, however, does not help us understand the complexities of cross-cultural interaction and its representation in literary works, and only burdens transnational literary and cultural studies with ideological baggage.

A year before Pamuk became the Nobel Prize winner, Qantara.de published an article written by the German professor Uli Rothfuss and the writer Achim Martin Wensien under the title “Turkish Literature in Germany: The Failings of Turkish Intellectuals” (Qantara.de 2005). In an extremely problematic language showing deep-seated assumptions, these two writers discuss the place of Turkish literature in the international literary scene: “Despite ample freedoms and opportunities to introduce readers to foreign literatures, Turkish literature suffers from a lack of publishers and readers in German-speaking countries and the western world in general” (Qantara.de 2005). Rothfuss and Wensien mention the Turkish writer Yaşar Kemal, who was awarded the Peace Prize of the German Book Trade in 1997 as the only successful “effort of

⁸⁵ In his essay “Gastarbeiterliteratur in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland” (included in *Zeitschriften für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 56 [1984]: 12), Harald Weinrich discusses the literature written by Turkish immigrants in Germany and the various representations of Turkish citizens in Germany in German plays and films.

interest” in Turkish literature in Germany. That is, Kemal was a success because he was granted a prize and thus recognized in Germany. Further, these two writers claimed that “no publisher would take on the immense risk and expense of translating and publishing Turkish books out of sheer enthusiasm.” Rothfuss and Wensien write that Celil Oker’s Istanbul mysteries appeal to German readers due to the “mixture of orientalist ambivalence, so exciting for the Central European reader, with exciting plots.”

Under the subtitle “Turkish Literature—What Is That?” the rest of the article derides the literary and intellectual output in Turkish, demonstrating sheer ignorance, understatement, and overgeneralization. Rothfuss and Wensien explain “the existing lack of Turkish-language literature in the market” thus:

In contrast to classical world literature, in Turkey literature does not perform the function of role model, source of inspiration or object of scholarship. Here literature almost exclusively performs two crucial functions, which people outside Turkey cannot relate to and are not interested in: it shapes and maintains identity and substitutes for politics to the point of serving as an ideological weapon, always in close interaction with Turkish society. Since the discourse on modernization began in the 19th century, through the era of Kemal Atatürk and up to the verge of EU accession and the accession debate, these functions have changed very little. ... The results have been catastrophic. Turkey has developed a literature with an almost total lack of self-referential structures. For example, to this day there are few critics who can be taken seriously, and they do not have the moral standards to take authors to task for a lack of objectivity. ... Turkey has been unable to develop pioneering works of literature and art with a chance at universal

validity. Those which have become known were carried by powerful political and ideological interests, rarely by readership. (Qantara.de 2005)

This commentary lacks basic understanding of what makes a literature deserve the title of “world literature” and what inspires text circulation and readership. The prominence of Turkish literature goes hand in hand with Turkey’s international and political image. In predominantly Christian Europe, there has been a lack of interest in the creative works of a country that has been defined by and identified with a different religion: Islam. The language of the article above is underlined by the assumption that there is something essential and inherent in the value of a given literature, in this case, Turkish literature. Literature written in the Turkish language is short of that value and therefore does not attract international readership. However, the history of literary reception is full of examples testifying that a literature comes into existence when there is an interest, curiosity, and readership for it. Since these factors are results of a complex network of relations and their discussion beyond the scope of this work, it suffices to say that this article reveals the limited take on Turkish literature a year before Pamuk received the Nobel prize.

Neither is the above article sufficiently researched nor do the writers care to contextualize and historicize the reasons for Turkey’s exclusion from the world literary and artistic canon. Rather than reconsidering the ethnocentric attitudes inherent in Europe’s lack of interest in Turkish letters, these two writers reinforce them and exclusively blame Turkish writers and intellectuals for their inadequacy. These two commentators do not consider the limited nature of translation activity from Turkish into European languages as a possible explanation of this situation. One is tempted to ask why there is not sufficient interest in and knowledge about Turkish literature and culture in Germany although Turkish citizens in Germany represent a large ethnic group today. The writers’ denigration of Turkish artistic accomplishments contradicts the

achievements of German Turks, who have authored books in German, performed on the theatrical stage and on the wide screen, and provided employment opportunities for Germans by establishing large industries in major metropolises. It is unfortunate that this argument appeared in Qantara.de, whose mission statement does not endorse this type of writing. The Arabic word “qantara” means “bridge,” and the mission of the portal is to promote “dialogue with the Islamic World.” The project is funded by the German Foreign Office (Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen)⁸⁶ in association with Deutsche Welle,⁸⁷ Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung,⁸⁸ and the Goethe Institute.⁸⁹ However, the article reveals a representative picture of Germany’s institutional, intellectual, and popular take on Turkish literature before the Nobel Prize.

Reception of Orhan Pamuk and *Das schwarze Buch* (1995) in Germany

Reception of Pamuk and his novels in Germany is both problematic and limited. Like any writer coming from an "unimportant" part of the world, Pamuk is welcomed as “different from the rest,” “discrete,” and a “particular” subject of his nation. He is seen as being “universal” in that he transcends national characteristics and stereotypes. At the same time he is seen as the representative of, the spokesperson, and the translator of the problems of his country, which

⁸⁶ The Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen (IFA: Institute for Foreign Relations) views itself as a service provider for foreign cultural policy, as an exhibitor, a future-oriented workshop for intercultural and civil-society dialogue, and as an information exchange and archive of foreign cultural policy through its library and documentation center.

⁸⁷ Deutsche Welle (DW) is dedicated to providing interested radio and television audiences and Internet users abroad with a comprehensive picture of political, cultural, and economic life in Germany, and to presenting and explaining German views on important issues.

⁸⁸ The Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung (Federal Center for Political Education) supports the efforts of all interested citizens to learn more about politics. The center's mission is to promote understanding of politics, to reinforce democratic awareness, and to strengthen citizens' willingness to engage in political work.

⁸⁹ The Goethe-Institut is the largest German cultural policy organization working outside Germany. The services it provides include cultural programs, language courses, libraries and information centers, visitors' programs, and much more.

“straddles between east and west. He is Turkey’s Kafka, Mann, Rilke, Dante, Joyce, and Borges. That is, he is a member of the “world republic of letters” while at the same time, he is attributed special knowledge and authority of “the clash and interlacing of cultures” in Turkey. Pamuk is interpellated as the political spokesman for the economic and demographic realities of Turkey, a country at the edge of being admitted to or turned away from the European Union while his writings are assimilated into a space of complex nationality. This limited and paradoxical characterization of Pamuk abroad has been criticized in Turkish literary and critical circles for reducing the highly heterogeneous contemporary Turkish literary production into a single internationally visible author.⁹⁰ The limits of this kind of critical discourse in Germany as well as internationally points to a problem of representation that is further complicated by translations and their various practitioners, a subject that goes unaddressed and often ignored.

In contrast to this attitude, in his book-length study of Turkish literature *Zwischen Steppe und Garten: Türkische Literatur aus tausend Jahren* (Between the Heath and the Garden: A Thousand Years of Turkish Literature), Wolfgang Günter Lerch lauds Pamuk for all the literary awards he has received thus far and takes these accomplishments as a sign that “die Türkei auch auf dem Gebiet der Literatur Europa und den Europäern immer näher rückt” (Turkey comes closer and closer to the standards of Europe and European literature; 190). Pamuk is “ein kultureller Brückenbauer, der mit seiner großen Romanen eine eigenständige ‘Kultur des Übersetzens’—von einer Kultur jeweils in die andere—geschaffen habe” (a bridge between cultures, who has created a unique “culture of translation” of one culture in respect to the other, with his substantial novels; 190). Furthermore, Pamuk deserves praise for bringing the Turkish prose literature to “Weltniveau” (the level of world literature; 190). Lerch sees the Nobel Prize

⁹⁰ For various discussions of Pamuk’s reception abroad by scholars and critics in Turkey, see *Hece: Aylık Edebiyat Dergisi* 10.119 (November 2006): 3–10, *Hece* 10.120 (December 2006), 11–12.

granted by the Swedish academy to a Turkish author to be the key for Turkey's recognition on the world literary scene. He notes that in Germany it was the Nobel Prize that increased the interest in the literature written in Turkish:

Dieser Schritt war eine Zäsur, deren Bedeutung für die Weltliteratur—von der türkischen gar nicht zu reden—kaum überschätzt werden kann. ... Es ist die Sprach und Literaturwelt aller Türken im weiteren Sinne, der sogenannten Turkvölker, über die in unseren Breiten immer noch wenig bekannt ist. (The importance of this [the Nobel Prize] for Turkish literature's recognition—which has gone almost unnoticed—among other world literatures can hardly be underestimated.... It is the language and literary world of virtually all Turks, the so-called Turkish folk, which is still little-known in our part of the world; Lerch 7; my translation)

Lerch's words suggest that Turkish literature is expected to look up to its European neighbors. It can never be appreciated on its own terms unless it resembles its European models, the yardstick of aesthetic value. Pamuk is seen as a successful writer because he has been able to translate his country's literature and culture into Western terms, and the Nobel Prize (a European yardstick) has granted this author and his country an entry into the realm of world literature. These comments imply that literary and aesthetic values are independent from political and historical formations. But Turkey's belated arrival on the world literary scene cannot be explained adequately without reference to a long history of exclusions and recognition.

In the same book, Lerch devotes significant space to his analysis and discussion of *Das schwarze Buch*. He recognizes the intertextual references of *Das schwarze Buch* to works by Rumi and Yunus Emre: "*Das schwarze Buch* bietet ein faszinierendes Spiel voller Rätsel und Andeutungen, eine Suche nach der verschwundenen Geliebten voller Beziehungen zur

islamischen Liebesmystik und ihrer poetischen Bildersprache, wie sie in Anatolien von einem Mevlana Celalettin Rumi und dem Derwischdichter Yunus Emre, der im 14. Jahrhundert lebte, entwickelt worden ist" (*The Black Book* offers a fascinating game, complete mystery, and overtones, a search for the runaway beloved, complete allusions to Sufism and to its metaphorical language, which was developed by Mevlana Celalettin Rumi and the dervish Yunus Emre in fourteenth-century Anatolia; 196; my translation). Lerch also sees connections between Pamuk's *Rot ist mein Name* and Thomas Mann's *Doktor Faustus* as well as similarities between Kafka and the central character of Pamuk's *Schnee* Ka (197). In the conclusion to his discussion of Pamuk's works, Lerch rightfully touches on the issue of the scarcity of translations from Turkish into German and sees this as a handicap to gaining a complete understanding of Turkish literature:

Er gibt ganze Bereiche der modernen Literatur, die in der Türkei, jedenfalls von eigenen Autoren, nicht behandelt werden. Nur Übersetzungen können etwa mit Science-Fiction-Literatur oder Fantasy-Literatur bekannt machen. ... Das oft behandelte Thema der Frau, ihrer Stellung in der Gesellschaft, die meistens sehr kritisch gesehen wird, gehört wieder zu den Fragen der Identität eines muslimischen Landes im Prozess einer sich „rückbesinnenden“ Verwestlichung. Es wird schon seit vielen Jahren behandelt, auch und gerade von Autorinnen. Die Verleihung des Nobelpreises an Pamuk wird sich mit Sicherheit belebend auf das literarische Leben in der Türkei auswirken und viele Schriftsteller beiderlei Geschlechts ermutigen. (In Turkey, there are volumes of modern literature by writers who have never been studied. Only translations can enable our familiarity with the science fiction and fantasy literature ... The often-discussed theme of women and their position in the society, which is sometimes very critically handled,

belongs to the identity questions of this Muslim country that is in the process of reconsidering its westernization. Pamuk's Nobel Prize will definitely enliven the literary scene in Turkey and will encourage writers of both genders; 200; my translation)

As is evident from this quote, Lerch realizes the importance of more translations from Turkish into German. His knowledge of the Turkish language allowed him to enjoy the fine aspects of literature produced in this language. International appreciation of the literature and culture of Turkey depends on translations and translation depends on the interest and demand of the target readership. Unless translations are made more widespread, mutual understanding across these two cultures continues to be limited, ridden with distrust and skepticism, and incomplete.

Although there are critics who read Turkish literature in the original, they do not consider the workings of translation. In her essay on the latest tendencies in contemporary Turkish prose literature, Börte Sagaster takes *Kara Kitap* as a representative of this body of literature and discusses the novel as an example of Turkish postmodernist novels by highlighting its intertextual and metatextual aspects (*Tendenzen* 14). Similarly, Priska Furrer reads *Kara Kitap* as a novel full of metafictional strategies and places it in the genre of "Kriminalroman" (331–33). She comments that besides its self-referential aspects, *Kara Kitap* situates itself in the wide area between the Western and Islamic literary and cultural traditions by alluding to various texts from these traditions. She points to the dialogue Pamuk's novel establishes with major works of other literary traditions. From the analysis of the aesthetic aspects of the novel, Furrer moves to the sociopolitical aspects of the text and points out that underlying all the "literary show-off" is the stark reality of Turkish society ("gesellschaftlich Realität"). She comments that the literary tricks and allusions are the author's commentary on the political problems and present-day predicaments of the Turkish state. Furrer concludes that it would be naïve to see all the questions

related to identity and authenticity, such as being oneself or being somebody else, as only variations on the narrative point of view. Rather, they are the author's direct statement on Turkish society and its identity crises at the end of the twentieth century (Furrer 333). Both Sagaster and Furrer read and cite the Turkish version of the novel. They leave out any consideration regarding translations from Turkish into German in general and Pamuk translations in particular.

In contrast, Stephen Gut, a German scholar who specializes in Turkish and Arab letters, does address the problem of translation. He writes an insightful review of the novel. Gut identifies correctly the overall thematic considerations of the novel: "Es ging vielmehr auch und vor allem um die Problematik menschlicher Identität im allgemeinen: Wer bin ich? Was macht mein Ich auf? Gibt es überhaupt so etwas wie eine unverwechselbare Individualität?" (It [the novel] is mostly about the general question of what constitutes human identity: Who am I? What constitutes me? Is there something like a stable identity?; 1995; my translation). Gut comments on the intertextual references between *Kara Kitap* and other literary texts:

Tausendundeiner Nacht, mystischer Abhandlung und Zeitungsglosse, James Joyce, Dante, Rilke, osmanischen Dichtern, Dostojewski, arabischen Philosophen, moderne türkischen Schriftstellern und ... und... und. Vor allem aber ein wunderbares Stück Grossstadtliteratur, eine Hommage an Istanbul, die ehemalige Hauptsatdt des Osmanischen Reiches und heutige Metropole eines Schwellenlandes am Schnittpunkt zwischen Europa und dem Nahen Osten, Geschichtsträchtigkeit und moderner Urbanität." (*Thousand and One Nights*, mystical essays and journalistic parodies, James Joyce, Dante, Rilke, Ottoman poets, Dostoyevsky, Arab philosophers, modern Turkish writers... and... and. Most of all a wonderful piece of city literature, an homage to Istanbul, the

former Ottoman capital and now the metropolis of an emerging country, an intersection between Europe and the Near East, a mixture of the historical and the modern; 1995; my translation)

What makes Pamuk's novel stand out for Gut is Pamuk's commentary on perennial questions such as individual and communal identity. Pamuk's aesthetic engagement with modern-day Turkey and its sociopolitical predicaments has brought him to the attention of international readership. Pamuk's skills in weaving together echoes from other literary texts into his narrative continue to earn this writer worldly recognition. As Gut notes, Pamuk has earned the title of "the author of the city" for his engagement with the city of Istanbul. In addition to thematic and intertextual considerations, Gut recognizes the fine formal aspects of the novel:

Celals Kolumnen, an denen Pamuks Ulysses sich in seiner Hilflosigkeit gewissermassen entlanghangeit, wechseln im "Schwarzen Buch" mit den Kapiteln ab, die den Fortgang der Ereignisse bei Galips detektivischer Suche schildern. In den Artikeln erscheint dem Schreiber die Vision eines ausgetrockneten Bosphorus, erinnert er sich an Aladins Wunderladen, steigt in unter der Stadt verlaufende byzantinische Geheimgänge hinab zu einem merkwürdigen Schaufensterpunppenkabinett, philosophiert über die Wiederkehr des Erlösers, erzählt die wundersame Geschichte eines Henkers. (In the *Black Book*, Celal's columns, through which Pamuk's Odysseus—in his desperation—finds his way around, alternate with chapters that reveal Galip's detective-like search. In these columns, the writer envisions a dried-up Bosphorus, remembers Aladdin's wonder-store, climbs up from the city's underground Byzantine vaults to a strange mannequin store, envisions the return of the savior, and relates a wondrous story of an executioner; 1995; my translation)

Although Gut does not explicitly note it, the comments above seem to be based on the Turkish version (Gut does speak Turkish). At the end of his review, he engages the German translation. He voices his distrust in the German reader's literary skills in understanding this novel and finds insufficient the glossary and the explanation regarding the names of the characters at the end of the German translation. His comments below suggest that the Turkish reader can understand this intricate and elaborate novel even though Pamuk resisted any temptation to write an epilogue or an afterword to the text. A literal translation, Gut comments, might not fulfill the same function for the German reader:

Ob sich diese und andere Dimensionen von Pamuks Enzyklopädie des postmodernen Daseins und Schreibens dem deutschsprachigen, in der islamischen Mystik wohl nur selten bewanderten Leser allein mit Hilfe der kurzen Erklärungen der Übersetzerin „Zu den Eigennamen der drei wichtigsten Protagonisten“ erschliessen, bleibt fraglich. Der Autor lehnte ein Nachwort ausdrücklich ab und hofft, dass der Roman auch so für sich selbst spricht. (It remains a question mark, whether the German speaking reader, who is rarely skilled in matters related to mystical Islam, would be able to unpack these and other dimensions of Pamuk's encyclopedia of postmodern *Dasein* and letters with only the help of the short clarifications of the translator's "About the Proper Names of the Three Central Characters." The author explicitly declined to write an afterward and hoped that the novel speaks for itself as such; 1995; my translation).

In this substantial review, Gut engages with formal and thematic aspects of the novel, comments on its intertextual and metatextual aspects, and recognizes the important role the translation plays in introducing this significant work to German readers. A mere literal translation of the novel will not suffice, says Gut. Even the glossary and the brief explanatory remarks at the end of the

translation are insufficient, according to Gut, to do justice to this otherwise dense literary text. The German reader will need more education to understand and fully appreciate all aspects of Pamuk's work.

Catharina Dufft's *Orhan Pamuks Istanbul* discusses Pamuk's novels in German in a similar fashion to Michael McGaha's *Autobiographies of Orhan Pamuk: The Writer in His Novels*, a study of Pamuk's novels in English. She discusses Pamuk's works in the context of world literature and points to the significant role played by translators and translations. Dufft's book offers German readers an introduction to Pamuk's oeuvre as a whole. She takes the concept of the city as a lens and reads Pamuk's works as expressions of the author's life around the city from his childhood till present day. Dufft points out that it is Nişantaşı, an upscale Istanbul district, where Pamuk was born and has lived most of his life, that is at the heart of his novels and often taken to stand for the city itself: "die besondere Dominanz des modernen Istanbulers Stadtteils Nişantaşı" (the specific dominance of Nişantaşı, the modern district of Istanbul; 1). About the place of the city in *Kara Kitap*, Dufft writes that Galip's search for Rüya and Celal takes place in Nişantaşı specifically and not so much in Istanbul, as the protagonist walks south of the neighborhood and back to Şehrikalp Apartmanı (99). Dufft concludes that Pamuk succeeds in making the city of Istanbul legible for the reader, bringing it to the level of other prominent cities in world literature such as London, Paris, and Dublin: "Aus meiner Sicht ist es Pamuk in seinem bisherigen Werk gelungen, die Stadt zu fassen, gangbar und erfahrbar zu machen und eine Balance zu finden zwischen einer sehr persönlichen und einer universellen Darstellung der Stadt" (In my opinion, in his works so far Pamuk is successful in summarizing the city, in making it visible and alive, and in establishing a balance between one very personal and one universal representation of the city; 166; my translation).

Discussions of and commentaries on Pamuk's novels in German for German readership are valuable accounts although most of them leave out discussions of the place of translation and translator in the cross-cultural exchange and understanding. Dufft's book is significant in that it discusses the place of Pamuk's works in the world literary canon. It calls for a closer look at the translations and how the translators' voices have shaped the reception of Pamuk's novels in German. As it is with the English translations, translations into German and their role in introducing Pamuk in Germany cannot be ignored.

Mark Kirchner, another critic, has a background in Turkology and reads Turkish. However, in his commentary on the novel, he fails to indicate precisely which text he reads, the original or the translation. His essay „*Das schwarze Buch*, Orhan Pamuk und die türkische Postmoderne,“ which is included in the proceedings edited by Konrad Meisig, *Orientalische Erzähler der Gegenwart: Vorträge und Übersetzungen der Mainzer Ringvorlesung im Sommersemester 1998*,⁹¹ provides a favorable discussion of the novel. He commends Pamuk for his accomplishment in providing his readers with multiple and rich interpretations of life in Istanbul. Kirchner identifies several levels in the novel: *Kara Kitap* as a detective novel, as a psychological novel, as a mystical text, a metafiction on creativity and writing, and a collection of stories about fiction. Kirchner sees the sum total of all these readings mobilized by the structure of the novel, a search for the beloved. In this essay, Kirchner writes about the original text in German for a German readership, at the same time that he quotes from the translation. Given his background in Turkology, Kirchner reads Turkish. However, he fails to indicate precisely which text he is addressing, the original or the translation. Often, he refers to the two

⁹¹ In this collection, the literatures in various languages such as Turkish, Arabic, Persian, Urdu, Hindi, Tamil, and Chinese are lumped together under the designation “Oriental literature” and their writers introduced as “oriental storytellers” (Meisig 2).

texts, Turkish and German, interchangeably. That is, there is an ambiguity in his referentiality. For instance, he remarks, “Übrigens wird die lateinische Quelle, aus der dieser Ibn Zerhani geschöpft haben soll, im Verzeichnis der Epigraphen unter dem Titel „obscuri libri“ vermerkt!” (Moreover, the Latin source from which this Ibn Zerhani is supposed to be taken, is listed under the title "obscuri libri" in the Index of Epigraphs; 56; my translation). The problem here is that only the original text has an index listing the sources of all the chapter epigraphs in Pamuk’s novel. That is, Kirchner must have used the Turkish text. The German translation instead provides a glossary of Turkish words that were kept in Turkish in the translation and a list of character names and relevant explanations.

To continue, Kirchner writes about the intertextual and self-referential aspects of the original text without considering that these do not find expression or are not equally consistent in the translation. He talks about the “gemeinsame orinetalische Erbe” (the collective orientalist legacy) in the novel, by way of addressing the original’s specific references to Ottoman and Arab literary traditions (56). Another oversight of Kirchner’s analysis, which is very much in line with the overall scope of the volume in which his essay is published, is his designating all the literatures of Turkish, Persian, and Arabic languages as “oriental” (“orientalischen”; 53). He writes that Şeyh Galip’s *Hüsn-ü Aşk* is an allegorical tale in the tradition of “der bekannten orientalischen Liebesgeschichten” (“the well-known oriental love stories”) and praises Pamuk for his success in transforming various aspects of the Sufi mystical tradition and postmodern literary techniques into an “orientalische Umfeld” (oriental framework; 55).

Monika Carbe’s insightful review of *Rot ist mein Name* (*My Name Is Red*) in the *Neue Literatur Zeitung* brings to our attention another point regarding translations, the significant function they perform in bringing the Turkish text closer to the German reader. Carbe notes that

the timetable the German reader will find at the end of the novel is helpful in understanding the text: “Hilfreich für Leser und Leserinnen, die der osmanischen Geschichte unkundig sind, ist—statt eines Glossar—die ausführliche Zeittafel am Schluss des Romans” (Helpful for readers with a limited knowledge in Ottoman history is the detailed timetable—not a glossary—at the end of the novel) (my translation). The Turkish text does not have a chronological timetable. The timetable that helps to contextualize the novel in time and geography was first appended to the novel by the English translator Erdağ Göknar and subsequently added to the German version.

In the final analysis, the most significant difference between Pamuk's reception in English and in German is that reviewers in German are writers who either specialize in Turkish studies or at least read the Turkish language. Reviewers in English, especially before the Nobel Prize, express puzzlement before Pamuk's novels and demonstrate a lack of fine-tuned interpretation and understanding of his writing. These reviews, written mostly by writers lacking knowledge and competency in the Turkish language, display assumptions as to what a Turkish novel should be. When the text does not meet this expectation, it is derided or negatively reviewed. Reception in German differs in that most of the reviewers read the Turkish texts. German reviewers have a fine understanding of Pamuk's works. Reviewers introduce Pamuk to the German reader by contextualizing Pamuk's works in relation to other world authors. In the German reviews, however, it is not clear which text these reviewers address, the Turkish or the German. This lack of precision suggests that these writers assume that the Turkish text and the German translation are each other's exact copies. German reviewers' commentary is more complex than that of their English colleagues in that German writers refrain from judging the text. They underline the importance and necessity of translation in better understanding of the literature and culture in Turkey, a point entirely absent from the English reviews. Other than

sheer rejection or unsubstantiated judgment (especially in English reviews), discussions of translations is lacking from all these analyses. None of these reviewers reflect on or engage with translations and translators.

The Translator Ingrid Iren

Ingrid Iren has an alternative view on the problem of translation and language in today's global world. Ingrid Iren (Brozka) was born in 1930 in Berlin. After completing her education in economics in Germany, she immigrated to Turkey in 1963 and studied archeology in Istanbul and Ankara. She worked as a translator at the Istanbul-Goethe Institute from 1977 to 1995. Since 1995, she has translated many works of Turkish literature into German, including short stories, essays, novels, poetry, and film scripts. Although she is well known for having translated novels by Orhan Pamuk, she has also translated literary works by eminent Turkish writers such as Adalet Ağoğlu, Nazlı Ölçer, Bülent Erkman, Leyla Erbil, Onat Kutlar, Ferit Edgü, Enis Batur, Sait Faik, Erdal Öz, Deniz Kavukçuoğlu, Özen Yula, Mahmut Temizyürek, Şener Özmen, Jaklin Çelik, Aysel Özakın, Güven Turan, Kemal Özer, and Cevat Çapan. Besides *Das schwarze Buch*, she translated Pamuk's *Die weiße Festung* (The White Castle; 2005), *Das neue Leben* (The New Life; 1998), and *Rot ist mein Name* (My Name Is Red; 2001). She cooperated with Gerhard Meier in translating Pamuk's Nobel Prize lecture *Der Koffer meines Vaters: Aus dem Leben eines Schriftstellers* (My Father's Suitcase: The Life of a Writer; 2010) and was one of the three translators involved in the translation of Pamuk's essay collection *Der Blick aus meinem Fenster* (The View from My Window; 2006) together with Cornelius Bischoff and Gerhard Meier.⁹²

⁹²Pamuk's *Das stille Haus* (The Silent House) (2009), *Istanbul: Erinnerungen an eine Stadt* (Istanbul: Memories of the City; 2007) and *Das Museum der Unschuld* (The Museum of Innocence; 2008) were translated by Gerhard Meier; *Schnee* (Snow; 2005) was translated by Christoph K. Neumann.

Iren's long record of translations from Turkish into German, her philosophy of translation, and her views on language and culture in today's global context, which I discuss below, reveal her mission as a translator. In a lecture Iren delivered at the Marmara University in Istanbul, Turkey (November 5, 2008), she pointed out that the history of translation coincides with the history of writing. She indicated that what makes translation difficult is the fact that each language was shaped and has been shaped by a certain way of thinking. Subsequent differences that have shaped languages and worldviews are what makes turning content from one language into another difficult:

So verschieden, wie die Schriftzeichen sind, so unterschiedlich drückt sich auch die jeweilige Mentalität im Umgang mit der Sprache aus—woraus sich übrigens eine der wesentlichen Schwierigkeiten beim Übersetzen von Sprachen ergibt. Doch dieser Vorgang, das Über-Setzen von einem Sprachufer an das andere, das Hineinfühlen in eine andere Mentalität, sollte, weil zu umfangreich, in einem anderen Kontext behandelt werden. (Similar to how various differences have formed among distinct alphabets, different ways of thinking have resulted from differences in languages—this is what makes translation from one language into another extremely difficult. This endeavor, the act of translating from one language into another, should be taken as an introduction into another worldview, since it is to be understood in another context.)⁹³

In the same lecture, Iren expresses her disappointment with technologically and materially driven modern-day lifestyle that came to overwhelm and eradicate more crucial aspects of cross-cultural understanding such as language and culture:

⁹³ Unless otherwise noted, all translations are mine.

Wenn sich nun dieses Denken, wie heute so oft, haupt-sächlich auf ökonomische und technische Begriffe beschränkt, wird die Sprache in einem wesentlichen Bereich vernachlässigt, sie degeneriert, wird reduziert. Natürlich wandelt sich die Sprache mit der Zeit, innerhalb ihrer Zeit, doch dürfte sie dabei niemals die Qualität ihrer Variationsmöglichkeiten einbüßen, die ihr ein Höchstmaß an Ästhetik, an Differenzierung im Ausdruck von Gedanken und Empfindungen garantieren—was jedoch bei der Überbewertung emotionsloser technischer und ökonomischer Begriffe unvermeidlich eintreten wird. Ebenso gefährlich ist die Reduzierung der Sprache auf ein möglichst niedriges Niveau, um sie, verbraucherfreundlicher' zu machen. Kann man mit der Ni-vellierung, mit einer vereinfachten Ausdrucksweise wirklich einen neuen Leseanreiz zur Kon-kurrenz der wilden Bilderwelt erreichen, die uns umgibt? (When, as it so often happens these days, ideas are limited mostly to economic and technical terms, language and its essence are neglected and reduced thus, it degenerates. Naturally, language changes with time. Yet language should never lose its ability to express variety, which guarantees it an advance level of aesthetics and allows for expressing difference in thoughts and feelings—which it loses with the increasing value placed on the emotionless technical and economic concepts. Similarly, it is dangerous to reduce language to the level of making it "consumer-friendly." Is it really possible for human beings to compete with the widespread images that encircle us when the capacity of language to express itself is thus reduced?)

Iren reflects on the physical and material impoverishment that follows linguistic impoverishment. She writes that when language is drained of its aesthetic qualities, mental and spiritual erosion follows:

Wenn das Denken und damit auch die Sprache vereinfacht werden, setzt langsam aber sicher eine seelisch-geistige Verödung ein. Somit verlieren die Menschen allmählich die Fähigkeit zum unabhängigen, kritischen Denken, büßen ihre Entscheidungskraft ein und werden absolut manipulierbar, sowohl für den Konsumwahnsinn, der die Natur zerstört und die globalen Ressourcen schon über alle Maßen reduziert hat. (When mental activity and with it language is simplified, a slow but steady psychic and spiritual desolation begins. Hence, humanity gradually forfeits its potential of independent, critical thinking, forfeits its power to decide, and subjects itself to manipulation, like that of consumerism, which destroys nature and reduces the global resources to masses.)

In particular, Iren is critical of rapid technological developments and advances in the electronics sector accompanied by images that promise a dream world and threaten to flood us. Reading books from a printed page is superseded by screen reading. Written texts are often simplified, cut short, and populated with buzzwords. We have to intake huge amount of information in order to be “up-to-date” while the time available is not sufficient for reflection. The negative consequence of these latest developments is “der Wandel, von dem auch die Literatur erfaßt wurde. Und gerade sie ist so wichtig für den Erhalt und die Weiterentwicklung von Sprache, Denken und letztlich Kultur” (what happens to language as a result. And in line with literature is also very important the preservation and further development of language, thinking, and lastly, culture). Iren’s take on language and culture is a result of her practice of translating from one language to another, an intimidating activity especially today when languages shrink and diminish in their power to express. This becomes challenging when the translator finds herself in need of creating and re-creating new vocabulary in the target language in order to meet source language concepts that do not exist or whose effect diminished in the target language.

Ingrid Iren's *Das schwarze Buch* (1995)

The most visible formal difference between *Kara Kitap* and *Das schwarze Buch*⁹⁴ is that the German text places the table of contents at the end of the novel. This shift of the contents page makes it difficult for the German reader to orient and map the reading experience. *DsB* is a thick and dense text, and reading it with the table of contents up front helps the reader map the journey of the protagonist more easily. The formal structure of the Turkish text is an indicator of a meticulous crafting of the novel into two parts with nineteen and seventeen chapters in each part.⁹⁵ These numbers often reoccur in the text; they provide a sense of wholeness, and suggest that the novel is self-referential and artistically crafted.

In addition to this visible shift, the German translation has a glossary (*Glossar*) at the end, providing definitions for some of the Turkish words retained in the translation and a list of names of the three main characters, *Zu den Eigennamen der drei wichtigsten Protagonisten* (In reference to the proper names of the three main characters; Pamuk *DsB* 505–8). This list explains the possible and probable references the names Galip, Celal, and Rüya have to other literary works. Obviously, the glossary and the list of names are necessary to allow the German reader to understand cultural and literary references of the Turkish text. These additional resources at the end of the translation alter the reading experience in German. They provide a sense of outside commentary and thus reinforce a specific reading of the text.

In addition, Pamuk's list of sources for the epigraphs he uses in each chapter of his novel is absent from the German translation. In the Turkish version, the end of the novel is followed by a list of works quoted, their authors, and their translators. That is, Pamuk acknowledges and pays

⁹⁴ *KK* and *DsB* subsequently.

⁹⁵ I discuss the formal aspects of *KK* in more detail in my first chapter.

homage to his literary sources and their masters.⁹⁶ This list also functions as an intertextual map of the novel and helps justify various interpretations of *Kara Kitap*. Its absence from the German translation renders the text ahistorical, giving the impression that this is an “original” creation and its writer an “original” author although in the Turkish the list is intended as an acknowledgment of an intercultural, interlingual exchange.

One of the most distinguishing signs of the translator’s style is the way she translates the first two chapters of the novel, which sets the stage for how the rest of the novel unfolds formally and stylistically. The translation begins with the following paragraph:

Rüya schlief, bäuchlings ausgestreckt, in der mollig-warmen Dunkelheit unter den Schattentälern und indigoweichen Hügeln des blaugewürfelten Steppdeckenreliefs, welches das Bett von oben bis unten überzog. Von draußen drangen die ersten Laute des Wintermorgens herein: einzeln vorbeifahrende Autos und alte Busse, vom Gehsteig her das dumpfe Klingen der Kupferkannen des Salepverkäufers, der sein heißes Getränk gemeinsam mit dem Pastetenhändler anbot, und die Trillerpfeife des Platzanweisers an der Dolmuşstation. Das Winterlicht, vom Dunkelblau der Vorhänge entfärbt, sickerte fahlgrau ins Zimmer. Noch schlaftrunken betrachtete Galip neben sich den Kopf seiner Frau, den die Steppdeckenkante freiließ. Rüyas Kinn war in den Federn des Kopfkissens vergraben. Etwas Unwirkliches umspielte die Neigungslinie der Stirn, man wurde ängstlich und zugleich neugierig auf die wunderbaren Dinge, die sich gerade jetzt in dem Gehirn dahinter abspielten. “Das Gedächtnis,” hatte Celal in einer seiner Kolumnen gesagt, “ist ein Garten.” “Rüyas Garten, Rüya’s Gärten...” war es Galip damals durch

⁹⁶ This list is often ignored by “purists” who have accused Pamuk of plagiarism. See Fethi Naci, “Dizeyi Anımsıyor Musunuz?” in *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar*.

den Kopf gegangen, “nicht an sie denken, nicht daran denken, sonst wirst du eifersüchtig!” Doch Galip betrachtete die Stirn seiner Frau und dachte nach. (*DsB* 9)

Different from the original and similar to the two English translations, the translator begins the text with the word “Rüya” followed by the verb “schief” (“slept”).⁹⁷ With this translation decision, Iren points to the centrality of the character Rüya, which means “dream,” and her act of sleeping. The adjective clause, which precedes the subject and the verb in Pamuk’s sentence, are listed in this translation after the phrase “Rüya schief.” Pamuk’s “yüzükoyun uzanmış” (“laying facedown”) is rendered as “bäuchlings ausgestreckt” (“laying on her stomach,” “stretched on her stomach”) rather than “mit dem Gesicht nach unten.” This discursive decision signals that the translator opts for literary re-creation rather than a literal translation. This is in line with the translation strategy Iren takes in the rest of the text. The German “mollig-warmen Dunkelheit” (“chubby-warm darkness”) stands for “tatlı ve ılık karanlık” (“sweet and warm”). The translator coins the word “Schattentälern” by bringing together the words “schatten” (“shadow”) and “tälern” (plural for “valley”) to meet Pamuk’s “gölgeli vadiler” (“shadowy valleys”). A similar literary invention is the word “indigoweichen” (“blue-yielding,” “indigo-reflecting”), coined from the words “indigo” for “blue” and the adjective “weich” for “mellow,” to meet Pamuk’s “mavi yumuşak” (“blue and soft”). In line with this literary re-creation is the word “Steppdeckenrelief” (“quilt’s relief”). Iren renders Pamuk’s “yorgan” (“quilt”) with the word “Steppdeckenrelief,” which she coins by bringing together the words “Steppdecke” (“quilt”) and “relief” (“relief,” “elevation of a part of surface,” “something that stands out or is distinct”). That is, the specific word choice of “mollig-warmen Dunkelheit,” “Schattentälern,” “indigoweichen Hügeln,” and “blaugewürfelten Steppdeckenreliefs” shows the translator at

⁹⁷ Gün’s translation begins with “Rüya slept” while Freely translates as “Rüya was lying,” the implications of which I discussed in the previous two chapters.

work re-creating in German the effect of the labyrinthine and aesthetically crafted original sentence and rather excelling in her craft. This word choice is especially significant in its suggestiveness of the shape of the cover over the character Rüya and the bed. It is like a sheet of paper with a text inscribed on it, covering and hiding what is in Rüya's mind and dreams and waiting to be decoded. This is extremely relevant here at the beginning of the novel, a mystery story, where Galip observes his soon-to-be-runaway wife, trying to understand what might be in her thoughts and motives. The translation makes it clear that it is the bed cover that stretches from top to bottom and covers Rüya. In the Turkish, it is not clear whether it is Rüya who stretches from top to bottom of the bed or the quilt.

The second sentence of the Turkish text, “Dışarıdan kış sabahının ilk sesleri geliyordu: Tek tük geçen arabalar ve eski otobüsler, poğaçacıyla işbirliği eden salepçinin kaldırıma konup kalkan güğümleri ve dolmuş durağının değnekçisinin düdüğü” (“From the outside, the first sounds of the winter morning were coming in: sporadically passing by cars and old busses; banging up and down the sidewalk were the copper jugs of the salep maker, who was in cahoots with the pastry-man; and the whistle of the shill”), is a demonstration of Pamuk's ability to capture the musical aspects of the Turkish language. Iren preserves this aspect of the sentence well when she writes, “Von draußen drängen die ersten Laute des Wintermorgens herein: einzeln vorbeifahrende Autos und alte Busse, vom Gehsteig her **das dumpfe Klingen der Kupferkannen** **des Salepverkäufers**, **der** sein heißes Getränk gemeinsam mit **dem** Pastetenhändler anbot, und **die** Trillerpfeife **des** Platzanweisers an **der Dolmuşstation**.⁹⁸ Iren's careful attention to alliteration and assonance in this sentence is obvious. The translator opts for words that re-create the music of the original in the translation. In addition, Iren coins the words “Salepverkäufers” and “Dolmuşstation” by bringing together the Turkish words “salep” (a

⁹⁸ All highlights, underlining, and italics are mine unless otherwise specified.

winter drink made of the roots of orchis) and “dolmuş” (shared taxi) with German words. This is an example of innovation of and addition to the target language through translation. The word choice “Trillerpfeife des Platzanweisers” (“the whistle of the usher”) is a better choice than just “Pfeife” since it recreates both in sound and style the original “değnekçisinin düdüğü.” This sentence follows the syntax of the original closely. Syntactical similarities between the Turkish and German languages allow the translator to follow closely the word order and punctuation of the Turkish text.

The sentence “Das Winterlicht, vom Dunkelblau der Vorhänge entfärbt, sickerte fahlgrau ins Zimmer” is a free translation of the original “Odada, lacivert perdelerin soldurduğu kurşuni bir kış ışığı vardı.” The German translation means “The winter-light, discolored by the dark-blue curtains, seeped in a pale waning gray into the room” while the original Turkish means “In the room, there was a laden winter light, which the navy curtains discolored.” The translation preserves the sense and meaning of the original but renders them in a literary rather than literal way. The translator opts for the word “Dunkelblau” rather than “Marineblau” for “lacivert” (“navy”) and thus maintains consistency with the word choice of “Dunkelheit” in the first sentence I discuss above. The two sentences “Noch schlaftrunken betrachtete Galip neben sich den Kopf seiner Frau, den die Steppdeckenkante freilieβ. Rüyas Kinn war in den Federn des Kopfkissens vergraben” in the German are meant to correspond to a single sentence in the original: “Uyku mahmurluğuyla Galip, karısının mavi yorgandan dışarı uzanan başına baktı: Rüya’nın çenesi yastığın kuştüyüne gömülmüştü” (“Half asleep, Galip looked at his wife’s head, which was poking out of the blue quilt: Rüya’s chin was buried in the feathers of the pillow”). In the original these two sentences are connected with a colon. This particular punctuation mark sets Galip on the side of the observer, away from what he is seeing and observing and yet at a

close distance. The colon reinforces the visual aspect of the original sentence. What follows after the colon is what Galip and the narrator-observer sees. The full stop in the translation renders the two acts as if they were independent from each other. This change in punctuation clarifies the original and makes it easier to read.

In the following sentence, “Etwas Unwirkliches umspielte die Neigungslinie der Stirn” (“Something unrealistic played itself on the line of the forehead”) renders the translation scientific and impersonal because of the word choice of “Neigungslinie.” Iren opts for the word “Gehirn” (“brain”), which is scientific jargon, rather than the word “Gedanken” (“thoughts”), which would have been more appropriate here. The scientific jargon used in the translation takes away from the literariness and suggestiveness of the text. In the original, Pamuk transforms Rüya’s forehead into a text that Galip tries to decipher in order to understand what might be going on in her head. Iren’s “Die Neigungslinie der Stirn” (“the line of the forehead”) is not specified as Rüya’s, which renders the sentence impersonal and ambiguous. The German word “man” (“one, somebody”) is impersonal and its reference general, while in the original it is clear that it is Galip who observes Rüya and it is Rüya’s facial impression he is trying to understand.

Two of the most significant sentences of the opening paragraph are the last two:

“Das Gedächtnis,” hatte Celal in einer seiner Kolumnen gesagt, “ist ein Garten.” Rüyas Garten, Rüya’s Gärten...” war es Galip damals durch den Kopf gegangen, “nicht an sie denken, nicht daran denken, sonst wirst du eifersüchtig!” Doch Galip betrachtete die Stirn seiner Frau und dachte nach” (“Memory” Celal had written in one of his columns, “is a garden.” “Rüya’s garden, Rüya’s gardens...” once, Galip thought, “don’t think about her [them], don’t think [of it], otherwise you will turn jealous!” But Galip looked at his wife’s forehead and thought [about it]).

As I discussed in more detail in the first chapter, in these two sentences Pamuk puns on the name Rüya (“dream” in Turkish) suggesting the possibility of multiple readings of this character and of the ambiguous situation in the opening of the novel. In addition, Pamuk foreshadows the significance of concepts such as memory, reading, and thinking for the interpretation of the rest of the novel, and points to Celal’s influence on Galip. This aspect of the Turkish text is the most difficult to translate to another language. It is at such strategic points that translators become visible through their literary inventions and interventions. Different from Gün and Freely’s translations, Iren puns on the word "Garten" (“garden”) and renders it plural the second time it repeats: “Rüyas Garten, Rüya’s Gärten...” This, however, gives rise to an alternative interpretation. It seems Rüya threatens Galip with her thoughts and possibly with her past. The plurality suggests that there are multiple Rüyas whom Galip is having difficulty recognizing as his wife. Galip does not know his wife very well, he is threatened by her thoughts and dreams, and appears insecure in the face of these multiple truths about her.

One characteristic aspect of *DsB* is its use of colloquial and conversational aspects of the German language to render the colloquial aspects of Pamuk’s language. As I discuss in more detail in chapter 1, Pamuk uses common speech and linguistic features of the Turkish language that occur in ordinary conversation and are distinct from formal or elevated language. Iren uses filler words in German to convey that aspect of the Turkish language. Using particles and filler words in German can lead to various interpretations. It involves some degree of *Sprachgefühl*, or a feeling for the language that comes with experience. Random examples from Iren’s translation support this argument:

Iren's translation	Pamuk's original
“ Doch Galip betrachtete die Stirn seiner Frau und dachte nach.” (9)	“Ama Galip karısının alnına bakarak düşündü.” (11)
„ Ach , du bist auch hier? Guten Tag!“, bis zu den unbequemen, bewußt erwarteten Erinnerungen, aber auch dem unvermuteten Anblick von Mönnerschatten, schmerzlich interessiert: “Verzeihung, mein Lieber, wo sind Sie meiner Frau begegnet, wo haben Sie sich kennengelernt?” (9–10)	“Sen de mi buradaydın, merhaba! Bilip beklediği tatsız anılar kadar, beklemediği erkek gölgelerini de merak ve acıyla görerek: Afedersiniz kardeşim, siz karımla nerede rastlaşmış ya da tanışmıştınız?.” (11)
“ Doch nein, vielleicht waren Rüyas Gedankengänge nicht so gedrängt voll, nicht so grausam, vielleicht auch befanden sich Ruya und Galip gerade in dem einzigen von einem Sonnenstahl erhellten Winkel dieses dunklen Gedächtnisgartens auf einer Bootsfahrt” (10)	“Hayir, belki de Ruya’nın hafızası bu kadar kalabalık ve acımasız değildi; belk de hafızasının karanlık bahçesinin, güneş düşen tek köşesinde, şimdi Ruya’yla Galip bir sandal gezisine çıkmışlardı.” (12)
“Unter den vom Bootstrand baumelnden, einander so ähnlichen Füßen und schmalen Fesseln floß das Meer träge dahin, glitten Algen, regenbogenfarbene Ölflecken, kleine, fast durchscheinende Kiesel und noch leserliche Fetzen von Zeitungen vorbei, auf denen— schau mal, wie weiß?!— vielleicht einer von Celals Artikeln stand.” (10)	“Sandaldan denize uzanan ve birbirine benzeyen ayaklarının ve ince bileklerinin altından ağır ağır deniz akardı; yosunlar, yeni renkli mazot lekeleri, küçük ve yarı saydam çakıltaşları ve üstünde Celal’in yazısı var mı diye baktıkları okunaklı gazete parçaları.” (12)

Another example of Iren’s creative way of recreating the colloquial expressions of Turkish comes when the grandparents want to smoke and quarrel away from little Galip’s eyes. They send him away thus: ““Los, geh nach oben zum Spielen!“, Soll ich mit dem Fahrstuhl

nach oben fahren?’ ,Allein soll er den Aufzug nicht benutzen!’ ,Soll ich mit Vasıf spielen?’ ,Nein, der ärgert sich!’ Was jedoch nicht stimmte.“ (12). Pamuk writes: „Çık yukarı git oyna sen, haydi.“ ,Asansörle mi çıkayım?’ ,Tek başına asansöre binmesin!’ ,Tek başına asanöre binme!’ ,Vasıf’la oynayayım mı?’ ,Hayır, kızıyor!’ Aslında kızmazdı.“ Iren meets the original „Çık yukarı git oyna sen, haydi” with “Los, geh nach oben zum Spielen!” The word choice "Los" corresponds to Pamuk’s colloquial "haydi" and reveals the translator’s attempt to translate creatively rather than literally. In German "los" is used to address cattle, animals, or little children; the word establishes hierarchy between the speaker and the addressee. The exchange above takes place when the grandparents take the upper hand and try to get rid of little Galip. Iren translates Pamuk’s "Aslında kızmazdı“ ("in fact he didn’t get mad") as "Was jedoch nicht stimmte" ("was not correct“ or "didn’t make sense"). As such, she meets the sense of Pamuk’s expression but also renders it in a style that is appropriate to the situation in which Galip responds to the overcontrolling grandparents. Although this expression is not in quotation marks in the Turkish and is the narrator’s words, in the translation it is a moment when the narrator and little Galip become indistinguishable.

In the same example above, Iren resorts to synonyms to break from Pamuk’s repetitiveness. She alternates the words “Fahrstuhl” and “Aufzug” when in the original the word “asansör” repeats. Iren’s word choice here is more sensitive to the situation and the speaker than is the Turkish. Little Galip uses the word “Fahrstuhl” while the grandparents use the word “Aufzug,” the standard for “elevator.” Using various synonyms in German to substitute for words that repeat in Pamuk’s text becomes a regular pattern in the translation, which I discuss below in relation to the word “rüya” (“dream”). That is, the translation is nuanced and demonstrates sensitivity to the situation in which the event takes place.

A third example of colloquialism comes when the grandparents quarrel about their smoking habits. Iren translates Pamuk's „Bir sigaram var zaten, ilişme allahaşkına!“ (14; I have only my cigarette, leave me alone for God's sake!) as "Laß mich doch endlich in Ruhe! Ich habe doch nichts mehr vom Leben, außer dem Rauhen!“ (13; Leave me in peace! I have nothing else in life but smoking!). That is, although she does not change the meaning, stylistically she renders it in a more colloquial way than it is in the original.

A further example of Iren's translation decision that sways away from the *hochdeutsche Standardsprache* is “wo Zank und Streit die Rechtsgeschäfte überwogen” (14), which Iren deems appropriate for the straightforward Turkish “avukatlıktan çok kavga ettiği” (“fighting rather than practicing law”; 16). Another example in the same pattern is the following. While Pamuk's sentence goes “bir an Celal'in ‘Beyoğlu Haydutları’ hikayelerinde kullandığı üslupla düşünerek” (“For a moment, he thought in a manner in which Celal used to write his ‘Beyoğlu Gangster’ stories”; 17), Iren translates it as “dachte er im Wiederbetrachten dieser Postkarte sekundenlang in der Celalschen Weise an die Geschichten vom Beyoğlu-Ganoven” (16). Iren not only maintains the general colloquial context of the Turkish but also manages to recreate the musicality of the Turkish language in the German text. This is evident in her translation of Pamuk's “Melih Amca, sanki yolladığı kartların ciddiye alınmadığına öfkелendiğini göstermek için, güzel karısı, güzel kızı ve bavul ve sandıklarıyla bir akşam İstanbul'a dönüp apartmana geliverince, tabii ki, Celal'in yaşadığı çatıkatına yerleşmişti” (“with suitcases and coffers”; 19). While Iren could have simply translated the underlined words as “mit Koffer und Säckel,” her translation benefits from the sound that “Sack und Pack” provides: “Als Onkel Melih, wie um seinen Zorn zu zeigen, dass man seine Postkarten nicht ernst genommen hatte, eines Abends plötzlich mit seiner schönen Frau, seiner schönen Tochter und allem Sack und Pack nach

Istanbul gekommen und im Haus der Familie aufgetaucht war, hatte er sich selbstverständlich mit den Seinen in dem bis dahin von Celal bewohnten Dachgeschoss niedergelassen” (19).

Another creative colloquial expression from Iren comes when she uses the word “Neuankommlingen” (“those who arrived anew,” “the newcomers”). In the Turkish text, the sentence “Üzerine günün bir saatlik güneşi vuran ve örtüsü mavi beyaz bir satranç tahtasını andıran kahvaltı masasında Anne ile Baba, apartman aralığını ele geçiren farelerden ya da hizmetçi Esmâ Hanım’ın hortlak ve cinlerinden sözeder gibi dün akşam çatı katına yerleşenlerden söz ediyorlardı” (20) refers to “çatı katına yerleşenlerden,” that is, “those who moved into the attic.” Iren translates the sentence thus: “Die Eltern saßen am Frühstückstisch mit der blauweissen Schachbrettdecke, den die Sonne täglich eine Stunde lang bedachte, und sprachen von den Neuankommlingen, die sich am Abend zuvor im Dachgeschoss niedergelassen hatten, wie von den Ratten, die man im Lichtschacht fing, oder wie von den Nachtmahren und Dämonen der Hausgehilfin Esmâ Hanım” (19). To match the meaning of the original, Iren uses a term that combines the adjective “neu” and the verb “ankommen” and adds the suffix “-lingen,” which is a diminutive modifier of nouns giving the physical sense of a younger, smaller, or inferior version of what is denoted by the original noun. This makes Iren’s translation a creative recreation of Pamuk’s sentence; it does not alter the meaning of the original although it adds a connotation and reveals the narrator/little Galip’s view of the “newcomers.” The translation foreshadows what is to come while the Turkish text is neutral and reserved. The sum of all these and other creative and colloquial discursive choices in Iren’s translation reveals Iren’s stylistic idiosyncrasies as a translator and creative writer.

In the following example, it is very important that the emphasis is on Celal’s newspaper column and on Galip’s addiction to reading Galip’s column to the point where the first thing that

comes to Galip's mind when he wakes up is the paper. However, in the translation, the emphasis is changed and this does not come up. Pamuk writes, "Galip, gazetenin kapının altından atılmış olacağını düşünerek tüy gibi hafif olmaya alışmış dikkatli hareketlerle yataktan kalktı, ama ayakları onu kapıya değil helaya götürdü, sonra da mutfığa" (20). Iren translates thus: "Gewohnt, sich leicht und lautlos zu bewegen, schlüpfte Galip vorsichtig aus dem Bett, um die Zeitung zu holen, die unter der Tür durchgeschoben sein mußte, wie er meinte, doch seine Füße trugen ihn nicht zum Eingang, sondern zum Klo und dann zur Küche" (20). This is the moment in the text where, after the flashback to when Galip saw Rüya for the first time, there is a return to the narrative present. Galip finally decides to leave the bed and the side of his sleeping wife due to his curiosity about Celal's newspaper column in the paper. The translation, however, by restructuring the order in the sentence, shifts the emphasis to the fact that Galip is a most sensitive husband, who, when getting out of bed, tries to be extremely careful and not wake up his sleeping wife.

In the following example, Pamuk's sentence follows the logic of Galip's thought. Galip sees a full ashtray and infers that Rüya must have stayed up all night to read, what else but one of her favorite genres, a detective novel. Pamuk writes, "Bakır küllük ağızına kadar sigara izmaritleri ile dolu olduğuna göre, Rüya yeni bir polisiye roman okuyarak ya da okumayarak sabaha kadar oturmuştu" (20–21). Iren translates thus: "Rüya hatte hier wohl, lesend oder nicht lesend, bis zum Morgen mit einem neuen Kriminalroman verbracht, da der kupferne Aschenbecher voller Zigarettensammel war" (20). The translation reverses the order of the clauses in the original sentence and thereby reverses the emphasis.

When Iren comes across one of Pamuk's incredibly long sentences, she cuts it down into three manageable sentences. Pamuk writes,

Apartmanı yaptırmaya başladıklarında Melih Amca buradaymış daha, Celal'in Galip'e yıllar sonar anlattığı gibi, şekerçi Hacı Bekir'in dükkanı ve lokumlarıyla rekabet edemediği için ve Babaanne'nin kaynattığı ayva, incir ve vişne reçellerini raflarına dizdikleri kavanozlarda satabileceklerini bildikleri için, önce pastaneye, daha sonra lokantaya çevirdikleri Sirkeci'deki şekerçi dükkanından ve Karaköy'deki Beyaz Eczane'den gelen babası ve kardeşleriyle buluşmak için, o zamanlar daha otuzuna basmamış olan Melih Amca da, içinde avukatlıktan çok kavga ettiği ve eski dava dosyalarının sayfalarına kurşun kalemle gemi ve ıssız ada resimleri çizdiği yazıhanesinden akşamüstleri çıkıp, Nişantaşı'ndaki inşaat yerine gelir, ceket ve kravatını çıkarıp, kollarını sıvayıp paydos saatine doğru gevşeyen inşaat işçilerini kızdırmak için işe girişirmiş. (16)

The most obvious reason for the length of this sentence is to give the reader a sense of the long and dense family business history, and how that relates to the family abode and to the ups and downs in the family's financial situation. To a Turkish reader living in or acquainted with the city of Istanbul, the sentence also gives a sense of familiarity and identification with the major business neighborhoods of Istanbul. "Şekerçi Hacı Bekir'in dükkanı" ("the candy maker Hacı Bekir's store") and "lokum" are two familiar cultural icons. The driving force behind this information is "Melih Amca" (Uncle Melih) and his relationship to the ups and downs of the family fortunes. Syntactically, it is not a typical Turkish sentence. Rather, Pamuk stretches far and beyond the limits of an ordinary syntax in Turkish.

Iren renders this in three sentences, each with an emphasis other than that of the Turkish sentence:

Zu Beginn der Bauarbeiten für das Apartmenthaus sei Onkel Melih keine dreißig Jahre alt und noch hier gewesen, wie Celal lange Zeit danach Galip erzählte. Abends waren der Vater und die Brüder aus der „Weißen Apotheke“ und aus dem Zuckerwarenladen in Sirkeci gekommen, den sie zunächst, weil sie dem Süßwarenhersteller Hacı Bekir und seinem Lokum keine Konkurrenz machen konnten, in eine Feinbäckerei, denn in ein Eßlokal umwandelten, wo sich die auf den Regeln aufgereihten Einmachgläser der Großmutter mit Quitten-, Feigen-, und Morellenkönfitüren noch gut verkaufen ließen. Dann hatte auch Onkel Melih, um sie zu treffen, sein Büro verlassen, wo Zank und Streit die Rechtsgeschäfte überwogen und er auf den Seiten alter Prozeßakten mit Bleistift Schiffe und einsame Inseln zeichnete, war auf die Baustelle in Nişantaşı gekommen, hatte Jacke und Schlips abgelegt, die Ärmel hochgekrempelt und selbst mit angefaßt, um die gegen Feierabend nachlässig werdenden Arbeiter anzufeuern. (14–15)

Iren's three sentences ease the difficulty of following the complicated logic of the Turkish sentence and makes reading easier than it is in the original. Aside from this benefit, however, the effect of the reading practice and the emphasis in each sentence is entirely altered. Iren's "Zu Beginn der Bauarbeiten" ("The beginning of the construction work") and "wie Celal lange Zeit danach Galip erzählte" ("as Celal was telling Galip for a long time later") are in line with the overall storytelling devices she scatters across the translation. That is, the first sentence emphasizes the "Bauarbeit" ("the construction work [on the apartment building]") and the sense of history and story being told to the second generation. The second sentence emphasizes the close relationship between "der Vater und die Brüder" ("the father and brothers") and gives the sense that they were closely involved in the shaping of the family business. Finally, the third sentence gives idea about the character "Onkel Melih" ("Uncle Melih"), his quarrelsome nature,

and his general dissatisfaction with the family businesses. In the Turkish sentence, the effect is to focus on Melih and to give a detailed description of his wheeling and dealing and his suffocating present situation, which eventually will lead him to leave the country, his family, and his wife and son. That is, there are significant differences in rhetorical and stylistic aspects between the Turkish version and its translation. The translation demonstrates the translator's active intervention in the text and her desire to present her reader with a well-ordered and readable product.

As I discussed in previous chapters, Pamuk often inserts parenthetical information into the narrative. Each translator demonstrates unique ways of dealing with this stylistic peculiarity. Parentheses and interjections are examples of the narrator's intrusion into the text and Pamuk's way of personalizing the narrative voice. At times, they modify a given character's whole utterance, at others they serve as a comment on single words or phrases. Parentheses and interjections can be omitted without surface semantic loss. When it is the narrator commenting on a specific situation or a word/phrase/saying, such interjections do not just modify the utterance but constitute an entire perspective, and the meaning of the work is substantially altered when they are omitted in the translation. Parentheses and interjections give chances to the narrator and author to comment on the situation and to relate a specific situation to contemporary Turkish culture and history more generally. Gün often entirely removes the parentheses while Freely retains them or adds her own parenthetical explanations where none exist. Iren, on the other hand, deals with them in a way that reinforces the meaning of the sentence in German. One characteristic example of this is the way she translates the following sentence. Pamuk writes,

Bir yıl sonra, Vasıf tek başına trenle Sirkeci'ye döndüğünde hala sağır ve dilsizmiş
„tabii“ *(bu son kelimeyi, bu konu açıldığında, Galip'in yıllarca sırrını ve nedenini*

çözemediği bir vurguyla Hale Hala söylerdi) ama kucağında elli yıl sonra büyük büyük büyük büyük torunlarıyla hala arkadaşlık edeceği ve ilk zamanlar başından hiç ayrılmadığı, kimi zamanlar heyecandan nefesi tıkanır gibi, kimi zamanlar da hüznle gözlerinden yaşlar akarak seyredeceği Japon balıklarıyla dolu sıkı sıkıya tuttuğu bir akvaryum varmış. (16–17; my emphasis)

Iren translates thus:

Vasıf war, als er nach Jahresfrist allein mit dem Zug nach Sirkeci zurückkehrte, immer noch taubstumm gewesen, „natürlich“, wie Tante Hale mit Nachdruck betonte (*wobei Galip, wenn das Gespräch darauf kam, den verborgenen Sinn dieses Ausdrucks jahrelang nicht finden konnte*), doch er hatte ein Aquarium mit japanischen Fischen fest umklammert gehalten, die er niemals allein ließ in der ersten Zeit, die er manchmal atemlos und mit deren Urgroßenkeln er noch fünfzig Jahre später befreundet sein sollte. (15; my emphasis)

It is remarkable that Iren was able to render this long and loaded sentence in German without cutting it short or restructuring it. She even retains the parenthesis. However, she rephrases the sentence in a way that makes more sense than it does in Pamuk’s version. She moves half of the parenthetical information, which relates “Tante Hale” to the body of the sentence, and renders Pamuk’s repetitive „büyük büyük büyük büyük“ as „Urgroßenkeln,“ thus making clearer the meaning of the sentence. In this case, the translation performs an editorial task. Another example of Iren’s reworking of Pamuk’s parentheticals is the following. Pamuk writes:

O zamanlar Galip, kendi yaşında olduğu söylenen amcasının kızı (yeni kelime ile kuzin)

Rüya’dan çok, Rüya’nın içinde yattığı cibinliğin insanı hayale çağıran korkutucu ve

uykulu mağarası ve siyah beyaz mağarayı eliyle aralayarak içindeki kızını gösterirken kameraya hüznle bakan Seyyide Suzan yengesiyle ilgilenirdi. (18–19; emphasis mine)

In this instance, Iren omits the parentheticals by inserting their content into the body of the sentence. She translates the sentence above thus:

Galip interessierte sich damals weniger für seines Onkels Tochter—mit dem neuen Ausdruck: Kusine—Rüya, die in seinem Alter war, wie es hiess, als für das Moskitonetz, diese *unheimliche, die Phantasie erregende Schlafhöhle*, in der sie lag, und für die traurig in die Kamera blickende Schwagerin und Seyyide Suzan, die mit einer Hand die schwarzweiße Höhle offenhielt und ihr darin liegendes Kind zeigte. (17; emphasis and italics mine)

Although removing the parentheses gives the text a polished look, in this particular instance removing the parentheses also omits Pamuk's mocking comment on the newly invented Turkish language and its "borrowed-from-the-West" diction. In Turkish, the expression for "cousin" used to be simply "amcasının kızı" (his or her uncle's daughter). With the 1923 language reforms and the "westernization" of the language, the Turkish Language Institute (Türk Dil Kurumu) adopted the word "kuzin" (cousin), which Pamuk in an aside, that is, in parenthesis, mocks explicitly. Because this appears not to have a semantic content, its omission seems innocuous. In isolated instances, such omissions make little difference. When they disappear throughout the text, this can have a profound effect on meaning and, as it is in this case, on the overall political message of the text.

Some writers and translators concern themselves with the printed page as a visual object, not just as a medium for conveying verbal messages. For these writers, mechanics and punctuation are important in their own right. Scholars working on translations have noted that

even when a writer's punctuation is visually striking, the translator's temptation is to impose greater normalcy on it (May 132; Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility* 42–43). It is difficult to assess the importance of punctuation in translations because it is the most conventional, deeply culture- and language-specific, and often unconscious aspects of written prose. However, studies that focus on how translators “normalize” writers' mechanics and visuals do not seem to be helpful in explaining the strategy Iren employs in the example below. In her translation, she uses mechanics as visual tools to render meaning where Pamuk does not use the same strategy. In chapter 1, when, in a flashback, the narrator relates little Galip's experience learning to read from an ABC book, Pamuk writes,

Alfabenin içindeki olağanüstü büyüklükteki at da mavileşip canlanırdı. Altında at olduğu yazan iri at, topal sucunun ve hırsız eskicinin arabalarının kemikli atlarından büyüktü. Galip o zamanlar bu sağlıklı alfabe atının üzerine, resim üzerine döküldüğü zaman onu canlandıran sihirli eczadan dökmeyi düşünüyordu. (The incredibly huge horse in the alphabet book would turn into blue and come alive. The huge horse, under which it said horse, was larger than the bony horses riding the carts of the lame water carrier and the thievish junk dealer. At that time, Galip was considering to spill a magic potion over this robust alphabet horse that would bring it alive. [12–13])

Iren writes,

Und das übergroße Pferdebild in seinem ABC-Buch durch den blauen Dunst lebendig werden ließ. Das mächtige Tier, unter dem die Buchstaben A+T=AT geschrieben standen, war größer als die knochigen Gäule vor den Karren des Wasserhändlers und des schlitzohrigen Trödlers. Damals dachte Galip daran, über dem kräftigen ABC-Pferd eine Zaubertinktur auszugießen. (11)

Both Freely and Gün translated this passage entirely differently, which could be seen as a sign of its complexity. In order to render the meaning of the sentence accurately, Freely altered the sentence structure and added her own explanations while smoothing over the linguistic imperfection of the original. Gün rendered the sentence exactly as it is, risking sounding “idiomatic” and “bizarre” to a mainstream English reader. As the quote above demonstrates, Iren’s translation is unique in that she makes use of visual aspects of language on the written page thereby reinforcing the meaning of the sentence by simultaneously recreating an image of it. She uses the phrase “ABC-Buch” rather than “der Primer” to give the meaning of the word “reading and spelling book.” This word choice makes the translation not only visual but also renders it in “global” English-German terms rather than in *Hochdeutsch*, the standard German. In addition, the inscription “A+T=AT” educates the German reader about Turkish by giving the equivalent of the word “Pferd” in Turkish and by literally performing the act of spelling in Turkish. That is, this instance of translating is literal and performative. It is also visual and pictorial, just like this would have been in a novice’s reading and spelling book. Another noticeable aspect of Iren’s translation is that she alternates synonyms for the word “horse” in German. That is, she uses the words “Pferdebild,” “Tier,” “Gäule,” and “ABC-Pferd” to ease the repetitive nature of Pamuk’s sentence while the original text uses the same word, “at” (“horse”) six times in three sentences.

The most obvious shift in the German translation of the novel is that of framing the context. Change in languages entails changes in the possibilities of references to the outside of the work. In previous chapters, I discussed how Güneli Gün and Maureen Freely solve the problem of recreating and compensating for intertextual and metatextual aspects of the original text, which would have been lost in translation unless re-created artistically. Intertextual and

metatextual references in the novel connect directly with the names of the three protagonists, Rüya, Galip, and Celal. These references reinforce and determine the interpretation of the plot and themes in the novel. In Gün's translation, these characters look up their names in a dictionary of Ottoman Turkish and find out the meaning, old and new, of their names. Motivated by and targeted for English readership, this strategy, in a creative way, accomplishes what a literal translation would not have made possible: the revelation of the meaning of the names and how these names actually determine the fate of these characters. Gün's solution is in line with Pamuk's overall political message in this novel; that is, his critique of Turkish language reforms, the language engineering that took place in the early years of the republic, and the negative effects of "modernization" on present-day Turkish language and culture. Freely, on the other hand, opts for parenthetical explanations of these names within the text, which reveals her goal to make the text readable and understandable and, by extension, reveals her control and authority over the text. Iren devotes a separate section at the end of the novel where she explains the meaning of these names and how they relate to other literary works. In addition, as the following example demonstrates, in specific moments in the text, Iren includes words and expressions that are not in the original and words that refer to the uncanny, fantastical aspects of the character Rüya, whose sole existence in the text is in Galip's mind. As I point out in the character analyses in the first chapter, save for the opening of the novel where Rüya sleeps, she is absent from the rest of the text. Iren writes,

Galip interessierte sich damals weniger für seines Onkels Tochter—mit dem neuen Ausdruck: Kusine—Rüya, die in seinem Alter war, wie es hiess, als für das Moskitonetz, diese *unheimliche, die Phantasie erregende Schlafhöhle*, in der sie lag, und für die traurig in die Kamera blickende Schwagerin und Seyyide Suzan, die mit einer Hand die

schwarzweiße Höhle offenhielt und ihr darin liegendes Kind zeigte. (17; emphasis and italics mine)

In the sentence above, the translator explicitly comments on Rüya's dreamy, evanescent nature when she inserts into the sentence the phrase "unheimliche, die Phantasie erregende Schlafhöhle." Pamuk's "insanı hayale çağırarak korkutucu ve uyuklu mağarası" literally translates as "the frightening and sleepy cave that calls one to fantasy" and could be rendered in German as "die beängstigend und phantastische Höhle, welches man zum fantasie abruf/einladet" or "die furchterregende, schläfrige Aushöhlung, die einen in die Vorstellung zurückruft." It is significant that at this specific point in the text, that is, when Galip sees Rüya for the first time, Iren inserts words such as "unheimliche" and "die Phantasie erregende" to call attention to the nature of the female character.

Pamuk crafts the first chapter of his novel by repeatedly creating associations between the proper name Rüya (meaning "dream"), the noun "rüya" ("dream"), and the verb "rüya görmek/rüyada olmak" ("to dream"). For instance, a paragraph before the name and the character Rüya are introduced to the reader, the narrator talks about the grandfather's dreams: "daha sık göreceği o *rüyadan* yeni sözetmeye başlamıştı" ("has just started talking about that *dream* he was going to see more often"; 13), "Dede'nin zaman zaman gözleri parlayarak anlattığı *rüyası* maviydi; lacivert bir yağmur *rüyada* hiç durmadan yağdığı için" ("The *dream* that Grandpa was narrating enthusiastically was blue; because a navy rain was pouring intermittently in the *dream*"; 15), "Babaanne, *rüyanın* hikayesini sabırla dinledikten sonra" ("after Grandma patiently listened to the story of the *dream*") and "Mavi *rüyanın* ve berberin sözünden sonra" ("after the blue *dream* and the barber's words"; 15). Since in the Turkish version the same word repeats five times in one short paragraph (consisting of five sentences) before the proper name is introduced,

once in small letters as “rüya” and subsequently capitalized as “Rüya,” the reader of the Turkish text easily comprehends the associations between the word “rüya” and the proper name “Rüya.” That is, in the Turkish version, the context prepares the reader for the multiple meanings one could associate with the female protagonist. In the German translation, though, this is not the case since a similar association does not exist between “Rüya” and “der Traum.”

In the German version, the expression “der Rede vom blauen *Traum*” (“the talk of the blue *dream*”; 14) followed by the actual proper name “Rüya” does not recreate the effect that is in the Turkish text. Related to this example is the way Iren solves the problem of Pamuk’s repetitive use of the word “rüya.” She alternates the words “der Traum” (“dream”), “eine blaue Vision” (“a blue vision”), and “die Traumgeschichte” (“dreamwork,” “dream story”), thereby breaking away from the monotony of using the same word. This strategy also works as a substitute for the loss of the links between the name and the act of dreaming in the Turkish version.

Conclusion

In the epigraph that opens this chapter, the translator Ingrid Iren talks about the intimate link between language and culture. The act of translating intimates and endorses the closeness between languages and cultures. Translation throws into perspective the incommensurability between them while at the same time it motivates us for the search for those serendipitous moments when differences across linguistic and cultural divides become indistinguishable in the translation.

The context in which the German translations of Orhan Pamuk’s works have taken place is quite different from the English language context I discussed in the previous two chapters.

Germany has built on a strong legacy of translation from other languages. As of the eighteenth century, writers and thinkers such as Goethe, Herder, and Rilke among others established the German literary scene as one open to texts from other languages. Translation has been seen as an act and art that enhances the writer's poetic skills and contributes to the enhancement of the national literary canon. Eminent German writers were translators as well. They took pride in their translations. Today, the value assigned to translation in Germany continues albeit not without considerations for material profit. German readers demonstrate openness to and interest in international publishing, which reaches Germany mostly through translation. Publishers, as elsewhere, see translation as beneficial as long as it provides material profit. This is drastically different from the minimal level of translation activity in the Anglo-American context. Today, translation into English from other languages continues to be extremely limited due to lack of interest and readership, which makes translation unfavorable in the eyes of publishers.

Although translations from Turkish into German are not among the highest ranking, after the Nobel Prize the rapid translation of Pamuk's works into German has opened the door for further translation and intercultural communication. Since then, there have been systematic endeavors to publish contemporary Turkish literature in German translation. There is no comparable activity in publishing translations of Turkish literature in English. The Nobel Prize brought Pamuk's works to the attention of the English publishers but this has not sustained further interest in Turkish literature internationally. The long-term impacts of the prize have yet to occur.

Close textual analysis of *Das schwarze Buch* reveals that when translated into German, *Kara Kitap* lost its open-ended signifying qualities and became a signified, interpreted, concluded, and commented-on communication between the author, the reader, the text, and the

translator. Jakobson identified these aspects of any translated text as a “reported speech” to the subsequent reader (115). As I demonstrated in the preceding pages, the translator makes use of creativity to recreate Pamuk’s text. She matches the effect of Pamuk’s long, labyrinthine, and aesthetically crafted sentence with corresponding German ones. She uses suggestive vocabulary and pays attention to the sound in the text. At times, Iren coins new vocabulary, a hybrid of Turkish and German words, which I see as a way of enriching the German language and expression through translation. Oftentimes she makes use of the colloquial and conversational aspects of German to render the colloquial aspects of Pamuk’s language. Iren eases the repetitious nature of the Turkish text by substituting various synonyms in German. However, the way the complete translation is presented to the German reader, with the table of contents at the end, with a *Glossar*, and an appendix complete with explanations and definitions, suggests further the loss of intertextuality of the Turkish text.

The extratextual material appended to the end of *Das schwarze Buch* takes away from the suggestiveness of the otherwise subtle literary text. The informational material clarifies the intertextual and metatextual reference of the Turkish text. It leaves readers with the impression that they would not have been able to relate to the text unless they were provided with specialized information regarding the text and the literature and culture it represents. Annotations suggest that there are aspects in the original text that are not translatable unless we read it with a dictionary in hand, in this case the *Glossar* at the end of the translation.

Literary translators tend to insert such information within the body of the text through literary techniques and creative ingenuity. Glossaries, extratextual references, and foot- and endnotes in translations alienate the reader and interfere with the enjoyment of the text. These additions give the impression that the text at hand is an academic and scientific study of a culture rather than a

literary artifact. Well-crafted literary translations keep readers' attention on the text and surprise them with "literary tricks" (Gün's translation being an example of this), which might not be in the original but serve the purpose of the original and create comparable functions.

Readers read other literatures for enjoyment and for understanding other cultures, which, in turn, help them understand themselves better. They do not invest time on comparing the original text and its translation to check for accuracy. Translators' creative interventions in such situations are to the benefit of original texts and to the subsequent readers of the translation. Expository material, additional footnotes, and glossaries are also the translators' tendency to assert translatorial (in lieu with editorial) authority and control. Extratextual material makes the text more accessible to readers and is often desirable. However, it should also be recognized as a tendency to encapsulate the work in translation, to assert a translator outside the text, and to deliver the work as a "signified" rather than a "signifier," in Saussurian terms. The same tendency is seen in translation punctuation. Iren often alters or omits the punctuation of the Turkish text per the requirements of the German language. Mechanics and visual aspects of translations such as punctuation and formal arrangements are significant in that they are an important site of interplay of author, translator, narrator, and the (implied) reader. Often translators explain their decisions by their search for what "sounds right" to them. However, punctuation appears to be a locus of translation control and the place where translators assert their visibility and authority.

In the end, *Das schwarze Buch* carries its translator's signature. The reception of the novel has to be understood in relation to the translation. This novel, its author, and the literature and culture it is taken to represent in Germany is heavily shaped by Iren. This calls for studies on other translators who have determined the reception of Turkish literature in the German context.

Conclusion

I began the research of this dissertation in order to explore the role of translation in the formation of the world literary canon. More specifically, I wanted to investigate how translators have come to shape the image of Orhan Pamuk as an international author outside his native country. For this purpose, I studied the reception of the translations as well as the actual translations and their relationship to the original novel. I began with the assumption that no translation equals the original and no translator is a mirror image of the author. Book reviews do not distinguish between original and translation, or between author and translator. They uniformly attribute all aspects of the text, such as content, form, and stylistic matters, to the original author. My close study of book reviews reveals that book reviewers take translation to be a transparent activity.

Underlining this study is the assumption that translation is not an evaluative and normative practice but an act of mediation that leads to further possibilities of meaning. Translation also is an act of negotiation between the original work and the new reader. As I demonstrate in the preceding pages, every translation is the result of specific conditions that give rise to it and that are not the same as those that give rise to the original work. Every translation bears the stylistic signature of its translator, which is not the same as that of the original author.

I would like to conclude by briefly summarizing some of the insights gained in the course of my analyses of the translations. In this dissertation, the study of translations is limited to the textual study of translations as products of the translators' creative acts of writing. In the course of my analysis, I came to realize that there are agents and factors other than the translators that impose control over the final product, such as the author, the publishers, the editors, time

limitations, and expectations for rapid translations imposed by circumstances and contracts. The published translation might not be entirely and exclusively what the translator wanted it to be. There have been cases in which the translator refuses to place her name on the translation due to the extensive modifications made to the text without her consent. These aspects of translation bring up the question of ownership(s) in relation to translations. Who owns the translation? Who carries the responsibility for it? How does this aspect of text production complicate further the problem of representation?

My study of translation theories let me to conclude that as helpful and thought provoking as these theories are, they need to be constantly tested in individual studies. Translation studies need to go beyond text linguistics. They need to be grounded in and illuminated by specific contexts that give rise to translations. I addressed book reviews and their limitations. Yet I could not venture further into the topic of translation criticism, which naturally follows from the analysis I provide here.

I see translations as a political activity that enriches literary systems by bridging them and providing literary and cultural exchange among them thereby challenging assumptions underlying national literary canons. Translating provides mutual benefits for both the source and the target literary systems, helping the less-known one to reach a wider audience while breaking the repetitive cycle at “home.” In the course of this study, I came to realize that translation is a process of rewriting, which creates infinite chains of signification where no closure is possible and thus no claims to exhaustivity.

As invisible as they may be, translations exist as texts: they circulate widely, and they are read and taught at schools. Multiple translations of the same work exist side by side. Often, scholarly work is based on translations. This study was motivated by the idea that translation

today is not an option but a necessity. The limitations of this study are commensurate with some of the questions it leaves out. One of the most exciting avenues that my work opens up is translation reception and criticism. Book reviews of translations are inadequate as criticism. There is much to be done to establish the parameters for translation criticism that is in par with literary criticism.

This study illuminates the work of Orhan Pamuk's translators, a substantial endeavor of cross-cultural activity that often times goes unnoticed, unacknowledged, and overshadowed by the author's international fame. The dissertation intervenes in world literary studies by calling attention to the place of translation and translators in the production and circulation of "worldly" texts. My effort to contextualize every translation in relation to the specific time and place of its publication and in relation to the specific audience it was intended for both informs and complicates our understanding of translation process and product.

Works Cited

- ‘Atṭār, Farīd al-Dīn, Dick Davis, and Afkham Darbandi. *The Conference of the Birds*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, U.K.: Penguin Books, 1984. Print
- Ackermann, Irmgard. "'Gastarbeiter' Literatur Als Herausforderung." *Frankfurter Hefte* 38 (1983): 56–66.
- Adak, Hülya. "Pamuk'un 'Ansiklopedik Romanı.'" In *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar*. Ed. Engin Kılıç. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996. 275–94. Print.
- Adelson, Leslie A. *The Turkish Turn in Contemporary German Literature: Toward a New Critical Grammar of Migration*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.
- Adil, Alev. "International Books of the Year." *Times Literary Supplement*, 5 December 1997, 5.
- . "Translating Orhan Pamuk." *Times Literary Supplement*, 26 March 1999.
- Ağaoğlu, Adalet. *Sich Hinlegen und Sterben*. Trans. Erika Glassen and Ingrid Iren. Zürich: Türkische Bibliothek, Unionsverlag, 2008. Print.
- Allen, John Alexander. "On the Road to Baghdad: A Picaresque Novel of Magical Adventures, Begged, Borrowed, and Stolen from the Thousand and One Nights (Book Review)." *Hollins Critic* 29, no. 2 (April 1992): 13–15.
- Altınel, Şavkar. "Putting a Tangible Shape on Time." *Times Literary Supplement*, 12 October 1990, 1087–88.
- Andrews, Walter G. "The Black Book and Black Boxes: Orhan Pamuk's Kara Kitap." *Edebiyât: The Journal of Middle Eastern Literatures* 11, no. 1 (2000): 105–29.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands: The New Mestiza = La Frontera*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 2007. Print.

- Apter, Emily S. *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006. Print.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Bakhtin, M. M., and Michael Holquist. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. Print.
- Barthes, Roland, and Stephen Heath. *Image, Music, Text*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977. Print.
- Bassnett, Susan, and Peter R. Bush. *The Translator As Writer*. London: Continuum, 2007. Print.
- Bassnett, Susan, and Andre Lefevere, eds. *Translation, History, and Culture*. London: Pinter, 1990. Print.
- . *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Vol. 11. Clevedon; Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, 1998. Print.
- Bassnett, Susan, and Harish Trivedi. *Post-Colonial Translation*. London: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- Bassnett, Susan. *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*. Oxford, U.K.; Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1993. Print.
- Bayrav, Süheyla. "Kara Kitap Ve Kendi Olmak." In *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar*. Ed. Engin Kılıç. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996. 73–79. Print.
- Becker, Jürgen Jakob. "Übersetzung." In *Das BuchMarktBuch: Der Literaturbetrieb in Grundbegriffen*. Ed. Erhard Schütz. Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, 2005. Print.
- Beckman, Jonathan. "Reviews: Books: Paperback of the Week: The Black Book Orhan Pamuk Translated by Maureen Freely." *The Observer (England)*, 6 August 2006.
- Bell, Anthea. "Translators on Translating: Inside the Invisible Art." In *Betray, Domesticate, or Negotiate?* Ed. Andrew Wilson. Vancouver: CCSP Press, 2009. 51–83. Print.

- Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminationen: Ausgewählte Schriften*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1961. Print.
- . "The Task of the Translator: An Introduction to the Translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens*." In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2002. 75–85. Print.
- Berman, Antoine. "La Retraduction comme Espace de la Traduction." *Palimpsestes* 4 (1990): 1–8.
- Bermann, Sandra, and Michael Wood, eds. *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005. Print.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London; New York: Routledge, 1994. Print.
- Biondi, Franco, and Rafik Schami. "Literatur Der Betroffenheit: Bemerkungen Zur Gastarbeiterliteratur." In *Zu Hause in der Fremde: Ein Bundesdeutsches Ausländer-Lesebuch*. Ed. Christian Schaffernicht. Fisherhude: Verlag Atelier im Bauernhaus, 1984. 132–50. Print.
- Bodmer, Johann Jakob, and Johann Jakob Breitinger, eds. *Der Mahler Der Sitten*. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1786. Print.
- Booth, Marilyn. "Translator v. Author (2007): *Girls of Riyadh Go to New York*." *Translation Studies* 1, no. 2 (2008): 198–212.
- Bowers, Maggie Ann. *Magic(al) Realism*. London; New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Boym, Svetlana. *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York: Basic Books, 2001. Print.
- Brendemoen, Bernt. "Orhan Pamuk and His *Black Book*." 16 April 2009, <http://www.orhanpamuk.net/interviews.aspx>.

- Brendemoen, Brent. "Orhan Pamuk-Bir Türkçe Sözdizimi Yenilikçisi." In *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar*. Ed. Nüket Esen. 1st ed. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996. 128–41. Print.
- Brenkman, John. "Istanbul Not Constantinople: Orhan Pamuk's Byzantine Empire." *Village Voice*, February 1995.
- Carbe, Monika. "Kulturkrieg mit Pinsel und Keule: Orhan Pamuk Entwirft Ein Mörderisches Intrigengespinst." *Neue Literatur Zeitung*, 9 October 2001: B6.
- Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004. Print.
- Catford, J. C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press, 1965. Print.
- Chiellino, Carmine. *Interkulturelle Literatur in Deutschland: Ein Handbuch*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2000. Print.
- Christ, Ronald. "Translation Watch." *PEN American Center Newsletter* 53 (Winter 1984): 8.
- Clej, Alina. "Walter Benjamin's Messianic Politics: Angelus Novus and the End of History." *Cross Currents: A Yearbook of Central European Culture* 11 (1992): 23–40.
- Clifford, James. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997. Print.
- Coe, Jonathan. "Up Against a Wall of Double Talk." *The Guardian*, <http://www.orhanpamuk.net/interviews.aspx>.
- Compagnon, Antoine. *Literature, Theory, and Common Sense*. Trans. Carol Cosman. Cambridge: Princeton University Press, 2004. Print.

- Cronin, Michael. "History, Translation, Postcolonialism." In *Changing the Terms: Translating in the Postcolonial Era*. Ed. Sherry Simon and Paul St-Pierre. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2000. 33–52. Print.
- Crystal, David. *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.
- De Man, Paul. "'Conclusions' Walter Benjamin's 'The Task of the Translator' Messenger Lecture, Cornell University, March 4, 1983." *Yale French Studies* 69 (1985): 25–46.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987. Print.
- Delisle, Jean, and Judith Woodsworth, eds. *Translators Through History*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1995. Print.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Des Tours de Babel." In *Difference in Translation*. Ed. Joseph F. Graham. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985. Print.
- . "What Is a 'Relevant' Translation?" In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 2000. 423–46. Print.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Margins of Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982. Print.
- Dirlik, Arif. "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism." *Critical Inquiry* 20, no. 2 (1994): 328–56.
- Dufft, Catharina. *Orhan Pamuks Istanbul*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2008. Print.
- Du-Nour, Meryam. "Retranslations of Children's Books as Evidence of Changes of Norms." *Target* 7, no. 2 (1995): 327–46.
- Durham, Carolyn A. *Literary Globalism: Anglo-American Fiction Set in France*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2005. Print.

- Eder, Richard. "The Quest: In the Land of the Defeated and Oppressed, to Be Is to Be Someone Else." *Los Angeles Times*, 25 December 1994, BR3.
- Eggleton, David. "Hidden City." *New Zealand Listener* 3472 (2006): 206.
- Emck, Katy. "Turkish Delight." *New Statesman* 126, no. 4358 (31 October 1997): 44–45.
- Erdim, Esin. *The "Survival" of a Literary Text: The Transformation of Images from the Sublime to the Picturesque in Guneli Gun's Translation of Orhan Pamuk's "Kara Kitap."* PhD dissertation, Kent State University, 1999.
- Erdim-Payne, Esim. "The Visible Translator: The Transformation of a Literary Text from the Sublime to the Picturesque." In *Memory of Richard B. Klein: Essays in Contemporary Philology*. Ed. Felice Anne Coles and Richard B. Klein. University of Miss.: Romance Monographs, 2005. 159–73. Print.
- Ertürk, Nergis. "Those Outside the Scene: Snow in the World Republic of Letters." *New Literary History: A Journal of Theory and Interpretation* 41, no. 3 (2010): 633–51.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem." In *Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 1976. 199–204.
- Fennell, Barbara A. *Language, Literature, and the Negotiation of Identity: Foreign Worker German in the Federal Republic of Germany*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997. Print.
- Fisher, Marc. "Neo-Nazi Attack Kills Three Turks in Germany—Firebombing of Woman, Girls, Plus Two Other Deaths Bring Toll in Attacks This Year to Sixteen." *Washington Post*, 24 November 1992, A16.
- Fishman, Joshua A., Charles A. Ferguson, and Jyotirindra Dasgupta. *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: Wiley, 1968. Print.

- Freely, Maureen. "Conversation with Orhan Pamuk." *Granta: The Magazine of New Writing*. 93 (Spring 2009). Web. 16 April. 2012. < <http://www.granta.com/Archive/93/A-Conversation-with-Orhan-Pamuk> >
- . "Misreading Orhan Pamuk." Middle Eastern Studies Association, 42nd annual meeting, Translated Turks: Tanpinar, Karasu, Tekin, Pamuk, and the Politics of Rendering Otherness. Washington, DC, November 22–25.
- . "Thoughts on Translation." *Literature Matters* (Autumn 2007).
- . "Translator's Afterward." *The Black Book*. Orhan Pamuk. New York: Vintage International, 2006. 463–66.
- . "A Translator's Tale." *World Literature Today* 80, no. 6 (2006): 30.
- Freud, Sigmund. *General Psychological Theory: Papers on Metapsychology*. New York: Collier Books, 1963. Print.
- Furrer, Priska. "Fesnter Zur Welt Oder Selbstrelektierender Spiegel? Referentialität Und Textualität in Der Modernen Türkischen Erzäalliteratur." *Asiatische Studien: Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Gesellschaft für Asienkunde* 50, no. 2 (1996): 321–38.
- Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, and J. A. Mojaddedi. *The Masnavi, Book I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Print.
- Gentzler, Edwin. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London; New York: Routledge, 1993. Print.
- Glassen, Erika, and Turgay Fişekçi, eds. *Kultgedichte: Die Macht Der Poesie am Bosphorus*. Türkische Bibliothek, Zurich: Unionsverlag, 2008. Print.
- Glossop, Sarah. "Languages in My Life: Maureen Freely." *Linguist* 45, no. 4 (2006): 108–10.

- Goffman, Daniel, and Christopher Stroop. "Empire as Composite: The Ottoman Polity and the Typology of Dominion." In *Imperialisms: Historical and Literary Investigations*. Ed. Balachandra Rajan and Elizabeth Sauer. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004. 129–45. Print.
- Gökner, Erdağ M. "The Novel in Turkish: Narrative Tradition to Nobel Prize." In *The Cambridge History of Turkey, Turkey in the Modern World*. Ed. Reşat Kasaba. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. 472–503. Print.
- Göktürk, Deniz, David Gramling, and Anton Kaes. *Germany in Transit: Nation and Migration, 1955–2005*. Vol. 40. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007. Print.
- Gommlich, Klaus, and Esim Erdim. "Evolving Imagery in the Translation of Orhan Pamuk's *Kara Kitap*." *Across Languages and Cultures: A Multidisciplinary Journal for Translation and Interpreting Studies* 2, no. 2 (2001): 237–49.
- Gottsched, Johann Christoph. *Versuch Einer Critischen Dichtkunst: Durchgehends Mit Den Exempeln Unserer Besten Dichter Erläutert*. Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1751. Print.
- . *Ausführliche Redekunst, Nach Anleitung der Alten Griechen und Römer*. Leipzig, 1743. Print.
- Graham, Joseph F., ed. *Difference in Translation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985. Print.
- Greenstein, Michael. "A Dream within a Dream; Istanbul's Reality, Fantasy: Fiction." *National Post*, 19 August 2006.
- Grossberg, Lawrence, Cary Nelson, and Paula A. Treichler. *Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Gün, Güneli. "Being Oneself and Another." *The World and I* 6, no. 4–6 (June 1991): 346–62.
- . *Book of Trances: A Novel of Magic Recitals*. London: J. Friedmann, 1979. Print.

- . "Interview with the Translator, Güneli Gün." In "The 'Survival' of a Literary Text: The Transformation of Images from the Sublime to the Picturesque in Güneli Gün's Translation of Orhan Pamuk's *Kara Kitap*." Esin Erdim. PhD dissertation, Kent State University, 1999. 208–34.
- . "On Quarantine Island." In *Remembering Childhood in the Middle East: Memoirs from a Century of Change*. Ed. Elizabeth Warnock Fernea. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002. 134–47. Print.
- . *On the Road to Baghdad : A Picaresque Novel of Magical Adventures, Begged, Borrowed, and Stolen from the Thousand and One Nights*. Claremont, CA: Hunter House, 1991. Print.
- . "Something Wrong with the Language." *Times Literary Supplement*, 12 March 1999.
- . "The Turks Are Coming: Deciphering Orhan Pamuk's Black Book." *World Literature Today: A Literary Quarterly of the University of Oklahoma* 66, no. 1 (1 December 1992): 56–63.
- Guth, Stephen. "Ulysses in Istanbul: Orhan Pamuks Roman 'Das Schwarze Buch.'" *Neue Züricher Zeitung und schweizerisches Handelsblatt: NZZ*, 1 June 1995.
- Haddawy, Husain, and Muhsin Mahdi. *The Arabian Nights*. New York: Norton, 1990. Print.
- Halman, Talat. "Preface: 1001 Turkish Nights." *On the Road to Baghdad: A Picaresque Novel of Magical Adventures, Begged, Borrowed, and Stolen from the Thousand and One Nights*. Güneli Gün. Claremont, CA: Hunter House, 1991. xiii–xv. Print.
- . "Ottoman Shadow Theater." *The World and I* 6, no. 4–6 (June 1991): 363–73.
- Halman, Talât Sait, and Jayne L. Warner. *The Turkish Muse: Views and Reviews, 1960s–1990s*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2006. Print.

Hatim, B., and I. Mason. *Discourse and the Translator*. London; New York: Longman, 1990.

Print.

Hermans, Theo. "Images of Translation: Metaphor and Imagery in the Renaissance Discourse on Translation." In *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. Ed. Theo Hermans. London: Croom Helm, 1985. 103–35. Print.

———. *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London: Croom Helm, 1985. Print.

Hinnenkamp, Volker. *Interaktionale Soziolinguistik und Interkulturelle Kommunikation: Gesprächsmanagement Zwischen Deutschen und Türken*. Vol. 232. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer, 1989. Print.

Holbrook, Victoria Rowe. *The Unreadable Shores of Love: Turkish Modernity and Mystic Romance*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994. Print.

Hopper, Paul. "Discourse Analysis: Grammar and Critical Theory in the 1980s." *Profession* 88, 1988: 18–24.

Hussein, Aamer. "Song of Scheherazade." *Times Literary Supplement*, 31 May 1991, 23.

Ingram, Susan. "'The Task of the Translator': Walter Benjamin's Essay in English, a Forschungsbericht." *TTR: traduction, terminologie, redaction* 10, no. 2 (1997): 207–23.

Innes, Charlotte. "Istanbul Expressed." *Nation*, 27 March 1995, 425.

Iren, Ingrid. "Sprache—Nährboden der Kultur." 15 November 2008, <http://ceviribilim.com/?p=1161>.

Irwin, Robert. "Tales of the City." *Times Literary Supplement*, 7 July 1995, 21.

- Irzik, Sibel. "Istanbul (*The Black Book*, Orhan Pamuk, 1990)." In *The Novel: Volume 2: Forms and Themes*. Ed. Franco Moretti. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006. 728–35. Print.
- Jacobson, Eric. *Metaphysics of the Profane: The Political Theology of Walter Benjamin and Gershom Scholem*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003. Print.
- Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 1959. 138–43. Print.
- Jalal al-Din Rumi, Mavlana, and William C. Chittick. *The Sufi Path of Love: The Spiritual Teachings of Rumi*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983. Print.
- Kadir, Djelal. "Turkish Family Romance." *World Literature Today* 66, no. 1 (Winter 1992).
- Kim, Sooyong. "Master and Disciple: Sufi Mysticism as an Interpretive Framework for Orhan Pamuk's *Kara Kitap*." *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin* 17, no. 2 (1993): 23–42.
- Kirchner, Mark. "Das Schwarze Buch, Orhan Pamuk und die Türkische Postmoderne." In *Orientalische Erzähler der Gegenwart: Vorträge und Übersetzungen der Mainzer Ringvorlesung im Sommersemester 1998*. Ed. Konrad Meisig. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1999. 43–64. Print.
- Kittel, Harald, and Andreas Poltermann. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha. London; New York: Routledge, 2009. Print.
- Koçak, Orhan. "Aynadaki Kitap/Kitaptaki Ayna." In *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar*. Ed. Engin Kılıç. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996. 142–83. Print.
- Koller, Werner. *Grundprobleme der Übersetzungstheorie Unter Besonderer Berücksichtigung Schwedisch-Deutscher Übersetzungsfälle*. Bern: Francke, 1972. Print.

- Konuk, Kader. *Identitäten im Prozess: Literatur Von Autorinnen aus und in der Türkei in Deutscher, Englischer und Türkischer Sprache*. Essen: Blaue Eule, 2001. Print.
- Koskinen, Kaisa, and Outi Paloposki. "Retranslation in the Age of Digital Reproduction." In *Special issue of Cadernos on Retranslation*: 19–38. 21 December 2009, <http://www.periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/traducao/article/viewFile/6175/5730>.
- Kreuzer, Helmut. "Gastarbeiter-Literatur, Ausländer-Literatur, Migranten-Literatur? Zur Einführung." *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 56 (1984): 7–11.
- Kumar, Amitava. *World Bank Literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003. Print.
- Lambert, Lose, and Hendrik van Gorp. "On Describing Translations." In *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. Ed. Theo Hermans. London: Croom Helm, 1985. 42–53. Print.
- LeClair, Tom. "Nabokov in Anatolia." *Nation*, 7 April 1997.
- Lefevere, Andre. "Translation Studies: The Goal of the Discipline." *Literature and Translation*. Eds. James Holmes, Jose Lambert, and Andre Lefevere. Leuven: ACCO, 1987. 234–35. Print.
- . *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*. Vol. 4. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1977. Print.
- . *Translation, History, Culture*. London; New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- . *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London; New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Lerch, Wolfgang Günter. *Zwischen Steppe und Garten: Türkische Literatur aus Tausend Jahren*. München: Allitera Verlag, 2008. Print.

- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, Karl Lachmann, and Christlob Mylius. *Gotthold Ephraim Lessings Sämmtliche Schriften. Neue Rechtmässige Ausg. ... Mit Lessings Portrait in Stahlstich*. Berlin: Voss, 1838–40. Print.
- Lewis, Philip E. "The Measure of Translation Effects." In *Difference in Translation*. Ed. Joseph F. Graham. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985. 31–62. Print.
- Lewis, Geoffrey L. *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967. Print.
- . *The Turkish Language Reform: A Catastrophic Success*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.
- Lionnet, Françoise, and Shumei Shi. *Minor Transnationalism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005. Print.
- Liu, Lydia He. *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity—China, 1900–1937*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995. Print.
- Luther, Martin, and Rudolf Lehmann. *Sendbrief Von Dolmetschen und Drei Andere Schriften Weltlichen Inhalts*. Vol. 2373. Leipzig: Reclam, 1887. Print.
- Malpas, J. E. *Place and Experience: A Philosophical Topography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Print.
- Mandel, Ruth. "Turkish Headscarves and the 'Foreigner Problem': Constructing Difference through Emblems of Identity." *New German Critique* 46 (1989): 27–46.
- Mango, Andrew. "Orhan Pamuk at the Heart of Turkish Sadness." *Cahiers d'études sur la Méditerranée orientale et le monde turco-iranien* 20, no. 20 (July–December 1995): 351–60.
- Mani, Bala Venkat. "On the Question, 'What Is Turkish-German?': Minority Literatures and the Dialectics of Exclusion." PhD dissertation, Stanford University, 2001.

- Mani, B. Venkat. *Cosmopolitical Claims: Turkish-German Literatures from Nadolny to Pamuk*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2007. Print.
- Mannes-Abbott, Guy. "The Black Book." *New Statesman and Society*, 7 July 1995, v.8: 41.
- Mars-Jones, Adam. "The West Has Eaten Our Underpants." *The Observer* (5 October 1997): 18.
- Martin, Brian. "Old Habits, New Lives." (London) *Financial Times* (1 November 1997): 5.
- Mattson, Michelle. "The Function of the Cultural Stereotype in a Minor Literature: Alev Tekinay's Short Stories." *Monatshefte* 89, no. 1 (1997): 68–83.
- Max, Bill. "Two Worlds: Turkey's East-West Tensions Spin Out Narrative Arabesques." *Boston Phoenix*. (1994), <http://www.orhanpamuk.net/popuppage.aspx?id=74&lng=eng>.
- May, Rachel. *The Translator in the Text: On Reading Russian Literature in English*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1994. Print.
- McClintock, Anne. "The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term 'Post-Colonialism.'" *Social Text* 31/32 (1992): 84–98.
- McGaha, Michael D. *Autobiographies of Orhan Pamuk: The Writer in His Novels*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2008. Print.
- . "The Poetry of Defiance." *Los Angeles Times Book Review*, 15 August 2004, R4.
- McGrath, Patrick. "Dark and Fantastic Invention." *Washington Post*, 12 February 1995, X06.
- McLemee, Scott. "The Black Book." *Newsday*, 23 July 2006.
- Meisig, Konrad, ed. *Orientalische Erzähler der Gegenwart: Vorträge und Übersetzungen der Mainzer Ringvorlesung im Sommersemester 1998*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1999. Print.
- Miller, Lucasta. "Behind the Veil." *New Statesman and Society*, 31 May 1991, 38.

- Miron, Susan. "A Turkish Novelist Makes a Breakthrough." *Philadelphia Inquirer*, 5 February 1995.
- Moran, Berna. *Edebiyat Kuramları ve Eleştiri*. Istanbul: İletisim Yayınları, 1999. Print.
- . *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış*. Vol. 3. Çağaloğlu, Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1994. Print.
- Naci, Fethi. "Dizeyi Anımsıyor Musunuz?" In *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar*. Ed. Nüket Esen. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996. 25–28. Print.
- Nakhshabī, Ziyā' al-Dīn, and Georg Rosen. *Tuti-Nameh, Das Papageienbuch*. Vol. 17. Bd. Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, 1912. Print.
- "The New Life." *Publishers Weekly*, 3 February 1997, 93.
- Nida, Eugene. "Principles of Correspondence." In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 1964. 154–67. Print.
- . *Toward a Science of Translating, with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964. Print.
- Nieraad, Jürgen. "Walter Benjamins Glück im Untergang: Zum Verhältnis Von Messianischem und Profanem." *German Quarterly* 63, no. 23 (1990): 222–32.
- Niranjana, Tejaswini. *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992. Print.
- "On the Road to Baghdad." *Publishers Weekly*, 13 September 1991, 64.
- Overfield Shaw, Yan. "The Gatekeepers' Price: Global Literary Reproduction, Translation, and Literary Forms in Orhan Pamuk's *The White Castle*." *Interactions: Ege University Journal of British and American Studies/Ege Üniversitesi İngiliz ve Amerikan İncelemeleri Dergisi* 18, no. 2 (2009): 97–122.

Pamuk, Orhan. *The Black Book*. Trans. Maureen Freely. New York: Vintage International, 2006. Print.

Pamuk, Orhan, and Güneli Gün. *The New Life*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1997. Print.

Pamuk, Orhan. *Beyaz Kale: Roman*. Istanbul: Can Yayınları, 1985. Print.

———. *The Black Book*. Trans. Güneli Gün. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1994. Print.

———. *Cevdet Bey Ve Oğulları*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1982. Print.

———. *Kara Kitap*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1990. Print.

———. *Other Colors: Essays and a Story*. Trans. Maureen Freely. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007. Print.

———. *Sessiz Ev: Roman*. Istanbul: Can Yayınları, 1983. Print.

———. *The White Castle: A Novel*. Trans. Victoria Holbrook. 1st U.S. ed. New York: Braziller, 1991. Print.

Parini, Jay. "Pirates, Pashas, and the Imperial Astrologer." *New York Times Book Review*, 19 May 1991, 3.

Parla, Jale. *Don Kişot'tan Bugüne Roman*. Cağaloğlu, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001. Print.

Parrinder, Patrick. "Mannequin-Maker." *London Review of Books*, 3 July 1995.

Prendergast, Christopher, and Benedict Anderson, eds. *Debating World Literature*. London: Verso, 2004. Print.

Pym, Anthony. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1998. Print.

Reiss, Katharina, and Hans J. Vermeer. *Grundlegung Einer Allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1984. Print.

- Reiss, Katharina. *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik. Kategorien und Kriterien Für Eine Sachgerechte Beurteilung Von Übersetzungen*. Munich: Hueber, 1971. Print.
- Ritter, Uwe A. C. *Remembrance and the Tradition of the Oppressed: Walter Benjamin's Messianic Hermeneutics*. PhD dissertation, Temple University, 1994. Print.
- Robinson, Douglas. *Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained*. Vol. 4. Manchester, U.K.: St. Jerome, 1997. Print.
- . *The Translator's Turn*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991. Print.
- Rothfuss, Uli, and Martin Wensien. "Turkish Literature in Germany: The Failings of Turkish Intellectuals and Writers." *Qantara.de: Dialogue with the Islamic World*, 26 July 2010, http://www.qantara.de/webcom/show_article.php/_c-310/_nr-188/i.html.
- Sagaster, Börte, ed. *Liebe, Lügen, und Gespenster: Erzählungen*. Türkische Bibliothek. Zurich: Unionsverlag, 2006. Print.
- . "Tendenzen in Der Zeitgenössischen Türkische Prosaliteratur." *Zeitschrift für Türkeistudien* 15, no. 1 (2002): 7–27.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994. Print.
- . *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978. Print.
- . *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983. Print.
- Santesso, Aaron. *A Careful Longing: The Poetics and Problems of Nostalgia*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2006. Print.
- Schimmel, Annemarie. *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975. Print.

- Schleiermecher, Friedrich. "On the Different Methods of Translating." In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 1813. 43–63. Print.
- Schottelius, Justus Georg, and Wolfgang Hecht. *Ausführliche Arbeit Von Der Teutschen Haubt Sprache*. 1663. Vol. 11–12. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1967; 1663.
- Schulte, Rainer, and John Biguenet. *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992. Print.
- Senger, Anneliese. *Deutsche Übersetzungstheorie Im 18. Jahrhundert (1734–1746)*. Vol. 97. Bonn: Bouvier, 1971. Print.
- Şeyh, Galip, and Victoria Rowe Holbrook. *Beauty and Love: Hüsn-ü Ask*. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 2005. Print.
- Seyhan, Azade. *Tales of Crossed Destinies: The Modern Turkish Novel in a Comparative Context*. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 2008. Print.
- . *Writing Outside the Nation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001. Print.
- Shaw, Yan Overfield. "The Gatekeepers' Price: Global Literary Reproduction and Literary Form in Orhan Pamuk's *The White Castle*." *Interactions: Ege University Journal of British and American Studies/Ege Üniversitesi İngiliz ve Amerikan İncelemeleri Dergisi* 18, no. 1 (2009): 97–122.
- Shohat, Ella. "Notes on the 'Post-Colonial.'" *Social Text* 31/32 (1992): 99–113.
- Smith, Joan. "Three Authors in Search of Body." *The Independent*, 13 August 1995.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamin, 1988. Print.
- . *Übersetzungswissenschaft-Eine Neuorientierung. Zur Integrierung Von Theorie und Praxis*. Tübingen: Francke, 1986. Print.

- Spires, Philip. "A Review of *The Black Book* by Orhan Pamuk." 3 February 2010, <http://www.buzzle.com/articles/a-review-of-the-black-book-by-orhan-pamuk.html>.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "The Politics of Translation." In *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000. 370–86. Print.
- . "Translating into English." In *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*. Ed. Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005. 93–110. Print.
- . *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Routledge, 1988. Print.
- Stahuljak, Zrinka. "Minor Empires: Translation, Conflict, and Postcolonial Critique." *Translation and Violent Conflict*, special issue of *Translator* 6, no. 2 (2010): 255–74.
- Steiner, George. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Print.
- Stocke, Joy. "The Melancholy Life." *Wild River Review* (2009): <http://www.wildriverreview.com/Interview/The-Melancholy-Life-of-Orhan-Pamuk/Literature/Joy-E-Stocke/2006>.
- Susam-Sarajeva, Sebnem. "Multiple-Entry Visa to Traveling Theory: Retranslation of Literary and Cultural Theories." *Target* 1, no. 36 (2003): 1–36.
- Teraoka, Arlene Akiko. "Gastarbeiterliteratur: The Other Speaks Back." *Cultural Critique* 7 (1987): 77–101.
- Tertilt, Hermann. *Turkish Power Boys: Ethnographie Einer Jugendbande*. Frankfurt a. M.: Surhkamp, 1996. Print.
- Thomas, D. M. "Crash." *Times Literary Supplement*, 6 April 1997.

- Toury, Gideon. "Culture Planning and Translation." 2009. <http://www.tau.ac.il/~toury/works/gt-plan.htm>.
- . *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995. Print.
- . "A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies." In *The Manipulation of Literature*. Ed. Theo Hermans. London: Croom Helm, 1985. 16–41. Print.
- Turkkan, Sevinc. "Hiroshima Mon Amour and Cache: Collapse of Private and Public Domains." *International Journal of the Humanities* 6, no. 8 (2008): 93–100.
- . "Orhan Pamuk's Kara Kitap: (British) Reception vs. (American) Translation." *Making Connections: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Cultural Diversity* (Spring 2010): 39–58.
- Tymoczko, Maria. "Translation and Political Engagement. Activism, Social Change, and the Role of Translation in Geopolitical Shifts." *Translator* 6, no. 1 (2000): 23–47.
- Tymoczko, Maria. *Translation in a Postcolonial Context: Early Irish Literature in English Translation*. Manchester, U.K.: St. Jerome, 1999. Print.
- Ungar, Steven. "Writing in Tongues: Thoughts on the Work of Translation." In *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization*. Ed. Haun Saussy. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006. 127–38. Print.
- Updike, John. "Vagueness on Wheels, Dust on a Skirt." *New Yorker*, 23 September 1991, 102.
- Venuti, Lawrence. Introduction to *Translation and Minority*, special issue of *Translator* 4, no. 2 (1998): 135–44.
- . *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. London: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- . "Retranslation: The Creation of Value." *Bucknell Review* 47, no. 1 (2004): 25–38.

- . *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London: Routledge, 1998. Print.
- . *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge, 2008. Print.
- Von Flotow-Evans, Luise. *Translation and Gender: Translating in the "Era of Feminism."* Vol. 2. Manchester, U.K.; Ottawa: St. Jerome; University of Ottawa Press, 1997. Print.
- Wade, Rosalind. "Contemporary Review: A Book of Trances." *Quarterly Fiction Review* 236, no. 1368 (1980): 45.
- "Weder Heimat Noch Freunde." *Der Spiegel*, 7 June 1993, 16.
- Weinrich, Harald. "Gastarbeiterliteratur in Der Bundesrepublik Deutschland." *Zeitschriften für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 56 (1984): 12.
- Wilson, Andrew. *Translators on Translating: Inside the Invisible Art*. Vancouver: CCSP Press, 2009. Print.
- Wilss, Wolfram. *Übersetzungswissenschaft: Probleme u. Methoden*. Stuttgart: Klett, 1977.
- Wright, Ronald. "From a Breeze-Block Istanbul." *Times Literary Supplement*, 10 October 1997, 23.
- Yavuz, Hilmi. "Fethi Naci Ve Ayna Meselesi." In *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar*. Ed. Engin Kılıç. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996: 70–72. Print.
- Yildiz, Yasemin. *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2012. Print.
- Young, Robert. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race*. London; New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- Yücel, Tahsin. "Kara Kitap." In *Kara Kitap Üzerine Yazılar*. Ed. Nüket Esen. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1996. 48–56. Print.

Zaimoğlu, Feridun. "Gastarbeiterliteratur: Ali Macht Männchen." In *Globalkolorit: Multikulturalismus und Populärkultur*. Ed. Ruth Mayer and Mark Terkessidis. St. Andrä/Wörtern , Austria: Hannibal, 1998: 85–97.